THE LIGHT OF TRUTH

— OR —

SIDDHANTA DEEPIKA.

A Monthly Journal, Devoted to Religion, Philosophy, Literature, Science, &c.,

***Commenced on the Queen's Commemoration Day,* 1897.**

VOL. IV. } MADRAS, AUGUST 1900. } No. 3.

Table of Contents.

	Pages.
Translations—	
The Vedànta-Sùtras with Srikantha Bhàshya by A. Mahadeva Sastri, B.A.	49
Sivagnana Siddhiar of Arul Nanthi Siva Chariar by J. M. Nallaswami Pillai, B.A. B.L., ...	53
Articles—	
Sankara's Commentaries on the Upanishads by M. Narayanaswami Iyer, B.A., B.L.	57
Articles Continued—	
The Vision of Sir Launfal, Part I by T. Virabadra Moodaliar, B.A., B.L.	62
The Problem of Evil No. IV by Alkondavilli G.	65
Nacchinarkkiniyàr by S. Anavaratavinayakam Pillai, M.A.... ...	68
Notes and Comments	71

**SUBSCRIPTIONS :—Advance Rate Rs. 4 per annum. Arrears Rate Rs. 6 per annum.
SINGLE COPY 8 ANNAS.**

☞ Important Notice :—All remittances, communications, and exchanges, &c., must be addressed to The Publisher, "*Siddhanta Deepika,*" Black Town, Madras.

The following is a true copy of the valuable circular on Sanitation recently issued by Mr. C. V. Swaminathaiyar, Editor of the *Viveka Chintamani*, along with his journal. It is the first of a series of circulars on the subject to be followed up in future from time to time.

Sir,—I have just returned to Madras after making a week's stay in Coimbatore, where I have been busy endeavouring to interest officials and members of Local Boards and Municipal councils in the sanitation movement now being started under the auspices of some of the best country lovers of both among Europeans and Indians.* I interviewed most of the District officials, from the Collector downwards, and many of the leading men in Coimbatore, all of whom received me kindly and gave a sympathetic hearing to my proposals in connection with spreading a knowledge of the elementary principles of sanitation among the people at large, and promised their co-operation to a certain extent. By kind invitation of the President, Coimpatore Taluq Board—who, by the bye, is in entire sympathy with the new movement I addressed a meeting of the members of that Board on Monday last, the 15th instant, and urged on the members the necessity of taking active steps in enlightening the people on sanitary matters and was fortunate enough to enlist their active sympathy for the movement. The Provincial Social Conference has also passed a Resolution on the subject, recognising the necessity of making special efforts, to enlighten the people on the elementary principles of sanitation. I append below a short appeal on the subject, which, I trust, will receive your earnest attention and favourable response.

APPEAL.

Writing in July, 1898, on the subject of educating the masses in sanitary matters, in reply to an editorial note on the subject that appeared in the *Madras Mail*, I related a bit of my own experience and concluded as follows :—

"What is wanted is an awakening of the masses to a consciousness of the evils that surround them every moment of their life owing to their living under insanitary conditions. The best way to do this under the present circumstances is by the wide circulation of useful tracts and by frequent lectures. The latter cource, if adopted and worked by a central organisation on a large scale and in a systematic way, would produce much beneficial result; but it would require such a large command of resources in men, money and brains, that it is impossible to think of any feasible scheme in the near future. The former course appears to me a little more feasible, and a begining at least could be made if only the educated people, including officials, would stand up and stretch out a helping hand. The Diffusion of Knowledge Agency is prepared to issue useful tracts on sanitation and public health, and other kindred matters, if some of our leading men who talk big on public occasions will give it a little help and support—not mere lip support, as they are wont to give in plently, but a little substantial help and support in hard cash or harder work. The Local Boards and Unions can do much by purchasing these tracts and distributing them among the people through the agency of schoolmasters, overseers, and others interested in the work. Dr. King quite approved of the feasibility of this idea; but the difficulty is that no idea, however feasible and good, takes practical shape in this country, unless brought out under the ægis of direct official support and countenance: and such countenance and support it is hard to obtain for an unpretentious agency, under existing circumstances."

It is proposed to publish regularly every month in the *Viveaka Chintamani* a series of easy papers on sanitation and allied subjects and to issue them afterwards separately in the form of tracts, which will be available at a moderate price for distribution among people by Local and Municipal Boards and Unions whose willing co-operation will form an essential condition of success for such a movement—by private persons and philanthropists and all others who are interested in the progress of sanitary ideas among the people.

The principle relied on for working the movement is that of utilising voluntary efforts and willing co-operation for public good by individual members of society; and if our endeavour to organise a voluntary Association of Helpers proves successful, it is proposed to organise a system of popular lectures in villages.

Besides what the Government can do and actually does by Acts and Regulations to promote village sanitation "there are other agencies from which much may be expected." The first of these is, to quote from the Government of India's Blue Book on village sanitation in India "the constant pressure of the Government officials, both as advisers of the people and in their Magisterial and executive capacity. There is no doubt they can do immense good by visiting the villages and impressing on the villagers the necessity of improved sanitation." The second, as ably urged by the veteran Miss Nightingale, "is the influence of the educated classes as missionaries of sanitary reform. There can be no better work for the educated class to undertake," and it is hoped "they will see the necessity of it."

I now appeal to all educated persons in general and to Presidents and Members of Local and Municipal Boards and Unions, and to Government officials in particular, who wield an immense influence for good over the people in this country, to lend their aid and co-operation to this movement and help to further the cause of sanitary reform by enlightening the people on matters that most vitally affect their well-being in every day life.

C. V. SWAMINATHAIYAR,

Triplicane, May 1899. *Secy. D. K. Agency.*

* The following is a list of persons who have up to date consented to lend the weight and influence of their names and their active interest in furthering the movement.

Lieut-Col. W. G. King, M. B., C. M., D. P. H, C. I. E., I. M. S.
The Hon'ble Mr. Justice Subramania Iyer, C. I. E,
H O. D. Harding, Esq., I. C. S.
M. R. Ry. R. V. Srinivasiar Avgl., Dewan Bahadur.
" V. T. Vedadrisadasa Moodr. Avgl., Retired Judge.
" H. Subraya Aiyer Avgl., Retired Dy. Collector.
" A. C. Pranaharthihara Iyer Avgl., Asst. Inspector of Schools
E. W. Legh, Esq., I. C. S.
M. R. Ry. T. S. Balakrishna Iyer Avgl., Public Prosecutor.
Dr. P. S. Chandrasekara Iyer M. B., C. M.
Dr. C. B. Rama Rao, L M. & S.
Rao Bahadur C. Nagoji Rao Avl., Inspector of Schools.

The following letter addresed by Mr. L. C. Innes F. M. U, a retired Judge of the Madras High Court on "The Vernaculars" to Mr. C. V. Swaminatha Ayar, Secretary to the Diffusion of Knowledge Agency may be of interest to the readers of our Review.

"I feel very much obliged to you for sending me your excellent paper on the encourgement of the vernaculars. The state of things disclosed is disheartening, as it is clear that the efforts that have been made by the several Universities have failed to bring about any improvement in the promotion of greater taste of vernacular literature, or of more extensive adoption of the vernacular as a medium for education and enlightment of the masses. It seems to me that very little can be done by the University through any change in the course of studies, whether by placing the vernaculars on a par with English or otherwise. More may be effected by reforming *school* education so as to enable the young student to receive a good grounding in his own vernacular through the medium of vernacular text-books. But even this will be of comparatively little use unless there is a good supply forthcoming of attractive literature for the young. Original Tamil literature of such a pure and harmless character as would alone be suitable would not, I take it, be sufficiently attractive to young people; and the transfusion of western literature into the vernaculars of India proceeds but slowly, and very little of it is, in its nature, likely *to* attract the young. To effect its object, the literature so turned into the vernacular must be amusing and instructive. As Mr. M. Shama Rao, M. A., of the Mysore Educational Department, intimates in the passage you have quoted from him at page 17 of your paper, the supply of such literature may be expected to create the demand, and when the demand is once created, the supply will still further promote it. For the more advanced your magazine and kindred works strike me as best adapted to keep up the taste once acquired by the young for vernacular literature. The University might do somewhat in the way of encouraging the vernaculars by offering prizes for vernacular essays. I am very glad you are taking up the subject and wish you every success. It is imposible that the proper instruction and enlightment of a people should be effected except through the medium of its own special vehicle of thought."

// THE
LIGHT OF TRUTH
— OR —
SIDDHANTA DEEPIKA.

A Monthly Journal, Devoted to Religion, Philosophy, Literature, Science, &c.,

Commenced on the Queen's Commemoration Day, 1897.

VOL. IV. } MADRAS, AUGUST 1900. } No. 3.

TRANSLATIONS.

THE VEDA'NTA-SU'TRAS WITH S'RI'KANTHA BHA'SHYA.

(*Continued from page* 29.)

Adhikarana 20.

The inclusion of (negative) conceptions concerning the Indestructible is necessary, because Brahman is the same and there is (a purpose served); as for instance in the case of the mantra of the upasad. This has been explained (before). (III. iii. 33.)

In the Gârgi-Brâhmana, while imparting a knowledge of Brahman, certain denials are made in the words "Neither gross, nor fine, nor short,"* and so on. In the Atharvana also they are found in such passages as the following:

"That which cannot be seen nor seized, which has no family and no caste,"† and so on.

A doubt arises as to whether, like bliss, etc, these should be comprehended or not in contemplating Brahman.

(*Pûrvapaksha*):—At first sight it would seem that those denials need not be comprehended in all contemplations of the Supreme, inasmuch as, unlike bliss, etc., they are not attributes.

(*Siddhânta*):—As against the foregoing we hold as follows: It is proper to include in all contemplations of the Supreme the conception of denials relating to the Akshara, the Indestructible, since Brahman, the possessor of the attributes, is the same in all places. It is, indeed, by means of these attributes, and in no other way, that a contemplation of Brahman as distinguished from all else becomes possible. For bliss and other attributes to distinguish Brahman from the pratyagâtman, they must be such as are unassociated with any mean qualities. And it is the very nature of attributes to always accompany the main thing of which they are spoken of as attributes. For instance: though the mantra "O Agni, know the Hotri's deed, and the sacrifice,"—which is enjoined in connection with the upasad of the purodâs'a in the Jâmadagnya

* Bri. Up. 3-8-8.
† Mund. 1-1-6.

sacrifice of four nights,—occurring in the Sâmaveda, has, as such,* to be recited aloud, still, inasmuch as it should follow the main thing,—namely, the upasad which pertains to the Yajur-veda,—the mantra should be recited in a whisper. This principle has been declared in the former or ritualistic section III. iii. 9.

From this it does not follow that all attributes will have to be included in the contemplation, as the Sûtrakâra says:

This much (alone should be comprehended), on account of thorough contemplation. (III. iii. 34).

'Thorough contemplation' means the contemplation to which one takes readily. Those attributes alone are to be comprehended everywhere, by which a contemplation of Brahman as distinguished from all else is possible. Accordingly it is necessary to comprehend in the contemplations of Brahman only those negative attributes, namely, "not gross," etc., which are mentioned in connection with the Akshara-Brahman, because they are attributes which serve to distinguish Brahman from all else; but it is not necessary to include also such attributes as "who does all deeds, who has all desires, who has all smells, who has all tastes."†

Adhikarana—21.

If you hold that in the (passage speaking of Him who is) within (all) (the s'ruti refers to) one's own self possessed of the aggregate of the elements, and that otherwise the difference cannot be explained, (we say), no, as in the case of the teaching (of the Sad-Vidya). (III. iii. 35).

In the Brihadâranyaka Upanishad, Ushasta asks: "Yâjnavalkya, tell me the Brahman who is visible, not invisible, the Atman, who is within all." The answer is given in the following words: "He who breathes in the up-breathing, he is thy A'tman and within all. He who breathes in the down-breathing, he is thy Atman, and within all...Everything else is of evil."‡ Then again Kahola asks "Yâjnavalkya, tell me the Brahman who is visible, not invisible, the Atman who is within all." But the answer is given in the following words: "He who overcomes hunger and thirst, sorrow, passion, old age, and death. When Brâhmanas know that Atman...they wander about as mendicants....Everything else is of evil."* Here a doubt arises as to whether the two Vidyâs are one or different.

(*Pûrvapaksha*):—Now, Ushasta's question refers to the pratyagâtman or the individual soul united to the aggregate of elements. Otherwise it would be difficult to explain the difference between the entity spoken of in the answer to that question and described as "He who breathes in the up-breathing, he is thy Atman," and the entity referred to in the answer to the question of Kahola and described as having overcome hunger, etc.

(*Siddhânta*):—As against the foregoing supposition the sûtrakâra states the siddhânta or final conclusion as follows: You should not say so. This section is like the teaching (of the Sadvidyâ):† "That Atman who is within all;" in these words the question was asked in both cases alike; and therefore in both cases, the Parames'vara Himself is the entity referred to in the question. And He alone can be the entity who is absolutely the cause of up-breathing, etc., and who has absolutely overcome hunger, etc., as stated in the answers to the questions. As in the case of the teaching of the Sad-Vidyâ (contemplation of Brahman as Existence), the repetition of question and and answer refers to one and the same subject. A difference in the questioner and in the form does not produce a change in the Vidyâ. Accordingly the sùtrakara says:

An exchange (should take place); for (they both) qualify (Brahman), as in the other case. (III. iii. 36).

Once the identity of the subject has been established, a mutual exchange of ideas should be effected between the two questioners. That is to say, Ushasta also shold contemplate Brahman as one who has overcome hunger, etc., while Kahola also should contemplate Him as the cause of up-breathing, etc. For, the passages occurring in both the sections specify the Parames'vara, as in the other case of Sad-Vidyâ. Wherefore as one and the same entity is spoken of in the questions and the answers, there is no difference in the Vidyâ. Repetition is intended to remove doubts, as in the case of "That, thou art."

Adhikarana—22.

The same (Deity is spoken of); for 'real' etc., (are repeated). (III. iii. 37).

As to the Sad-Vidyâ also, which has been cited to illustrate the conclusion arrived at in the preceding

* The rule is that in sacrificial rites the mantras, of the Sâma-Veda should be recited aloud while those of the Yajur-Veda should be recited in a whisper.

† Chhâ 3-4-2.

‡ Bri. Up. 3-4.

* Ibid. 3-5.

† Chhâ. 6.

adhikarana, there arises a doubt as to whether the Vidyâ is one or different.

(*Púrvapaksha*):—As a repetition is found in the questioning, and as a difference is found in the answers, at each turn a different Vidyâ must have been taught.

(*Siddhánta*):—As aginst the foregoing we hold as follows: There is no difference in the Sadvidyâ. The same Mighty Deity, referred to in the words "This Devatâ," etc.,* occurs in every question and in every answer. "That is real, That the Atman, That thou art;" in these words, again and again, reality and other attributes are found repeated. Therefore, the Entity being one and the same, the Vidyâ is one and the same.

Adhikarana—23.

(The attributes such as the possession of unfailing) desires should be comprehended in the several cases, because of the abode, etc., (being the same).
(III. iii. 38).

The Dahara-Vidyâ,—contemplation of the Divine in the heart—is taught in the Chhândogya, in the Taittirîyaka, in the Brihadâranyaka, and in the Kaivalya Upanishads. Are they all one and the same, or are they different?

(*Púrvapaksha*):—In the Chhândogya, the eight chief attributes, including sinlessness, of the Being dwelling in the small lotus of the heart, and spoken of as Dahara-âkâs'a, are declared in the passage which begins with the following words:

> "There is this city of Brahman (in the body) and in it the palace, the small lotus (of the heart), and in it that small ether."†

In the Taittiriyaka the attributes of the Divine Being dwelling in the small lotus of the heart—as the One designated by the word 'Sound (Nâda)' which is the root of the Pranava, as the One denoted by the term the "Mighty Lord (Mahes'vara), as the One who is dark-brown, as the One who has divers eyes—are declared in the passage "small, sinless,"‡ etc. In the Brihadâranyaka-Upanishad are mentioned the attributes such as lordship, in the following passage "There is ether within the heart. In it there reposes the ruler of all, the lord of all, the king of all."§

In the Kaivalya-Upanishad the attributes of the Supreme Being dwelling in the heart-lotus—as the three-eyed, as the dark-necked, as consciousness and bliss, as having Umâ for His mate, and so on—are declared in the following passage:

> "Regarding the heart-lotus unstained and quite pure, and in its centre contemplating Him who is ...all-pervading; who is intelligence and bliss, the formless, the wonderful; Him whose help-mate is Umâ; who is the supreme Lord, mighty, three-eyed, dark-necked, serene."

Now, since dark-neckedness and the like are the attributes of the body and since reality, etc., are the attributes of A'tman, they are two opposed sets of attributes and cannot therefore be included in one contemplation. Therefore they are different Vidyâs.

(*Siddhânta*):—As against the foregoing we hold as follows: Because the same abode of the heart-lotus is mentioned in the several places, the vidyâ is one and the same. Therefore the attributes—such as "whose desires are true"—should be comprehended in all cases. Sinlessness and other attributes mentioned in the Chhândogya, lordship and other attributes mentioned in the Brihadâranyaka, the attribute of being designated by the Pranava and other attributes mentioned in the Taittiriyaka, the attribute of being consciousness and bliss in essence and other attributes mentioned in the Kaivalya-Upanishad,—all these attributes of Brahman should be comprehended in the Dahara-vidyá. The attributes of Brahman, described in the Kaivalya-Upanishad in the words "whose help-mate is Umà," "one who has three eyes," are identical in meaning with those of Brahman which are described elsewhere in the words "one who is dark-brown," and "one who has divers eyes." Repetition here is calculated to produce a high regard. The same construction should be put upon all attributes which are thus repeated. The Brahman is the being of whom all these attributes are predicated, and as such He alone is the object of worship in all cases, so that the Supreme Brahman should be contemplated in the middle of the small heart-lotus as endued with sinlessness and so on, as the lord of all, as the thing denoted by the syllable 'om,' as one whose help-mate is Umà, as Three-eyed, as Dark-necked, as Consciousness and Bliss, as Infinite, Immortal, Wonderful. Accordingly this contemplation is the most essential in all contemplations of the Supreme. In the Chhândogya and the Kaivalya-Upanishads, it is said that he who devotes himself to this contemplation is said to attain, as the fruit thereof, to the Supreme Brah-

* Chhâ. 6-3-2.
† Op. Cit. 8-1-1.
‡ Mahâ. 10.
§ Bri. Up. 4-4-22

man Himself, the object of all worship, transcending the region of Prakriti or the material universe:

"Having reached the Highest Light he appears in his true form."*

"Having meditated thus, the sage reaches Him who is the womb of all beings, the Witness of all, transcending darkness."†

Thus, as the attributes of dark-neckedness and the like as well as the attributes of sinlessness and the like are ever present in Brahman, and as each set of attributes presupposes the other, nothing stands in the way of our comprehending them all in one act of contemplation. The denials would be quite out of place if there were no occasion for them. On seeing the Supreme Brahman described as possessed of a body having three eyes, one would naturally attribute to Him other attendant attributes of the body, such as sin, old age, death, hunger, thirst, vain desires, vain purposes; and it is to prevent this that the sruti declares that He is devoid of all sin, and so on. Though the Supreme Brahman is endued with a body having three eyes and so on, still, He is free from all sins, free from old age, free from grief, free from hunger, free from thirst. His desires are true, his purposes are true, He is consciousness and Bliss. Hence no incongruity.

Adhikarana 24.

(*Objection*):—If in the form of Brahman there should exist such parts of the body as would entitle Him to be described in the words "dark-necked," and so on, as He is described in the words "love is His head," then He would be subject to growth and decay and would therefore cease to be "dark-necked."

(*Answer*):—The sûtrakâra says:

Because of high regard, there is no failure. (III. iii. 39).

In the preceding sections it has been determined that Brahman has a form described as dark-necked, etc., that He is associated with the Supreme Power (Parama S'akti) designated as Umâ, and that He has all the attributes including unfailing will and so on. Now a doubt arises as to whether at any time these attributes cease te exist in the Supreme Brahman, or they never cease.

(*Pûrvapaksha*):—At first sight it would seem that they cease at some time, inasmuch as they are merely imagined in the Supreme Brahman for the sake of contemplation.

(*Siddhânta*):—As against the foregoing we hold as follows: They never cease to exist in the Supreme Brahman because of the high regard the sruti shows for them by way of repeating in all cases His association with Umâ and other attributes. Hence the description of the Supreme Brahman as one of unfailing potentialities.—Where are they repeated with high regard?—We answer, everywhere. Though it has been declared that He is dark-brown and divers-eyed, *i. e.*, that He is associated with Sakti and three-eyed, still, again, to shew indeed its high regard for them, the s'ruti repeats "Whose help-mate is Umà, who is the Supreme Lord, the Master of all, who has three eyes."* In the S'ruti treating of the contemplation of the Divine Being in the solar orb, He is, again, out of high regard, described as the Lord of Umâ, in the words "Homage to the Golden-armed, to the Lord of gold, to the Lord of Ambikâ, to the Lord of Umá."† Elsewhere, again, that the I's'vara is dark-necked, is, for the sake of regard, again repeated in the words "whose neck is dark, who is deep-red;"..."Homage to the dark-necked, to the black-throated,"‡ and so on. It is only to inspire high regard that the attributes of unfailing will and the like are repeated again although they have been once mentioned. Wherefore, on account of the high regard for them which the sruti shows by way of repeating them again and again, the attribute of being the Lord of Umâ and such other attributes never cease to exists in the Supreme Brahman.

In the case of Dharma and Brahman,—the subjects that are unknowble from any other source of knowledge,—those who follow the authority of the sruti should accept whatever that Divine s'ruti says as to their nature. Otherwise, if we follow that line of reasoning which is opposed to the sruti, it can never be established that Brahman is the material cause of the Universe, and so on. Accordingly, after having declared that Brahman is Existence and Consciousness and the Infinite, in the words "Existence, Consciousness, the Infinite, is Brahman,"§ the sruti itself again declares with reference to Him

"The Right, the Real, is the Supreme Brahman, the Person who is dark and brown, whose semen is held above, who has divers eyes. . . . ;"||

i. e., the sruti declares Brahman's conditioned form, that He is three-eyed and that He is associated with Umâ, the Supreme Power (Paramas'akti). And again, in the words "that is the one bliss of Brahman,"¶ the sruti says that He is possessed of unsurpassed bliss. With reference to Him again, the sruti says

"Whose body is âkâs'a, whose nature is true, whose delight is life whose manas is bliss, who is replete with peace, who is immortal."**

* Chhâ. 8.3-4.
† Kaivalya-Up.

* Kaiv-Up.
† Máhánâ. 18.
‡ Tait. Sam. 4-5.
§ Tait. Up. 2-1.
|| Mahânâ. 12.
¶ Tait-Up. 2-8.
** Tait. Up. 1-6.

A. MAHADEVA SASTRI, B.A.

(*To be continued.*)

SIVAGÑA'NA SIDDHIYA'R
OF
ARUL NANDI SIVA A'CHA'RYA

SUTRA III—PASU LAKSHANA.

Adikarana—I.

(*Continued from page* 32).

The combination of all the foregoing is not the soul.

5. If the *atma* is stated to be the combination of all the above senses and sensations, then the seer will only see them each separately and not a single whole (atma). If you say these various things themselves in fact constitute the soul, then the man who cognises them all together is different, as the object perceived is quite distinct from the perceiving subject.

NOTES.

The view of the soul (Jivatma) refuted here is credited to the Sautrantika Buddhists by some commentators and to Mayavadis by others. We have not been able to get from the followers of the latter school a proper definition of the Jivatma, nor a uniform one; and one Swami of Chidambaram when we pressed him for a definition stated that it was an *ollapodrida* of the abhasa of Brahman, and antakarana and other lower products of Maya. Our reply to him was:—which of these was in *Bandham*, (bondage) and which of these was to reach Mukti (freedom)? The Abhasa of Brahman is either Brahman or is not. If it is Brahman, it can suffer no bondage nor does it require to be freed. If it is not, then we reck not if it is in bondage or not. It cannot matter to us either whether the antakarana and lower senses do or do not suffer. Be it here once more stated that our distinct position is that the Jivatma we postulate is one above the antakaranas and is in no sense an *ollapodrida* of any number of things. He it is that is constrained and dragged by sin and desire, and suffers pain. The following passages from the Upanishads clearly bring out the distinction.

"I'sa supports all this together, the perishable and the unperishable, the developed and the undeveloped. *The Anîsa,* atma, is bound,* because he has to enjoy (the fruits of Karma); but when he has known God (Deva) he is freed from all fetters."

"There are two, one knowing (I'swara) the other not knowing (Jîva), both *unborn* (aja), one strong, the other weak; there is she* the unborn, through whom each man receives the recompense of his works; and there is the Infinite *Atma* (appearing) under all forms, but Himself inactive. When a man finds out these three, that is† Brahma.

"That which is perishable is the Pradhana; the immortal and imperishable is Hara.‡ The One God (Eko Deva) rules the perishable (Pradhana) and the *atma*. From meditating on Him, from joining Him, from becoming one with Him, there is further cessation of all illusion in the end."

"When that God (Deva) is known, all fetters fall off, sufferings are destroyed and birth and death cease." (Swetas 1. 8, to 11).

"On the same tree, *man* (anîsa) *sits grieving immersed, bewildered by his own impotence*: But when he sees the other, I'sa, contented and knows His glory, then *his grief* passes away." (Mundaka. III. 1. 2).

"*Fools dwelling in darkness,* wise in their own conceit, and puffed up with vain knowledge, *go round and round staggering* to and fro like blind men led by the blind."

Katha. I. 2. 5.

See further page 11 *et seq.* Part III. Nityânu Sandhana Series, where a good resume of the whole subject is given. Only we could not find the text "Athrayam Purushassvayam Jyotir-Bavate" at Brihad VI. 3. 9, and the Soul cannot be called *self-luminous* though in union with God, is may be found to be self-luminous.

* Anîsa and I'sa, atma and Paramatma, Purusha and Parama-Purusha, Jiva and Param or Brahman, Pasu and Pathi, Agna and Gna are parallel sets of terms meaning Soul and God. I'sa in these passages does not mean a personal God but the Highest Brahman.

* She is Pradhana or Prahkriti and not Devatma Sakti.

† That here means man, *i. e.,* man when he understands the distinction of the thripadartha becomes God. The three means Pasu, Pathi and Pasa. And Iswara and Brahma in this passage do not mean respectively Personal God and Impersonal God but mean the same Being. According to Sankhyas, the true knowledge of Pasa and Pasu, Prakriti and Purusha, alone gave liberation.

‡ Prof. Max-Muller observes on this word, "he would seem to be meant for I'swara, or Deva or the One God, though immediately afterwards he is taken for the true Brahman and not for its phenomenal divine personification only." *i. e.* in one and the same mantra, Hara means both the Personal God and the True Brahman! When it is further seen how in other passages, the same learned Professor and others of his ilk read Siva and Rudra for the True Brahman, wherein is the real distinction between I'swara and Brahman. The word Iswara or Isa (the first word in the Isa Upanishad) originally meant in the Upanishads and Brahma Sutras only the Highest Brahman, not any Phenomenal something or nothing. The word 'I'swara' has however been used by Sankara and his followers as meaning the lower Brahman in a restricted sense. Misled by this later use of the word, our Professor and others would often take the Iswara and Isa of the Upanishads in the later restricted sense. And hence the inconsistency and confusion which arises in their interpretation of these passages. Forget for once this distinction when reading the Upanishads, then the whole meaning will be clear. The Upanishad writers had no prejudice in using the words Isa, Iswara, Hara, Rudra, Siva, Deva, Mahadeva, and Maheshwara, as the present day Vedantists would seem to have.

Adikarana—2.

In this adikarana are reviewed the various theories which have been propounded in regard to the nature of the soul; and they require very close attention.

Soul is derived from God by Parinama? No.

6. You state that the soul possessing the qualities of Intelligence, Will and Power of the Supreme, stands to the Supreme as heat to fire, as guna to guni in Bethâ Betha relation and appears variously. If so, then the Jiva need not be possessed of senses and organs to become intelligent.

NOTE.

God is self-luminous, and if soul is also God, it must be self-luminous also. But the soul in union with the body shines with the light of the body itself, as it will do so with the Light of the Lord when in union with the Lord.

The Sankhyan doctrine refuted.

7. If it is stated that the *atma* is pure intelligence and not possessed of *gunas* like will and power, then it cannot develope will and power. If it is replied that these gunas are acquired from the body and in the *Presence* of the atma, then, these powers must be found also when the body is dead or dead asleep. But if it is again said, that this is due to the death or the sleep of the body itself, the statement that these are brought into activity by the Presence of the *atma* stands contradicted.

The same.

8. It is again said that the *guna* is induced by the Presence of the *atma* just as the magnet attracts the iron. If so, it can only induce its own power of attracting objects and not that of repelling objects. On the other hand, the *atma* induces such varying actions such as thinking, and forgetting, running sitting, reclining, standing &c.

The Paurânika's doctrine. The soul has form? No.

9. If the soul is said to possess a form, then this form must be apparent in the body. Then also it will become indistinguishable from matter which undergoes transformation and distinction. It must again be perceived when this *atma* enters the womb. You reply that it is *sukshuma* and imperceptible to the eye. Just so, your own words belie your theory that it has a form (perceptible).

The soul has neither sukshuma form.

10. If you say it has *sukshuma* (subtle) form, then you are evidently mistaking the atma for the subtle cause of the gross body namely manas, Buddhi, ahankara and the five tanmatras (the *Puriashtaka*). If you say no, and would make it even more subtle than the *Puriashtaka*, then according to us, there are even *tatvas* higher than *Puriashtaka*, like *Kalai, Ragam, Viddhei* &c., and all these are material and *achit*, and perishable.

The soul is Rupâ Rupa. No.

11. If the soul is said to be *RupâRupa*, then know that *Rupa* cannot become *Arûpa*, and *Arûpa* cannot become *Rûpa*. One thing cannot have two contradictory natures. If you say, it is like the fire latent in the wood, then as the fire shows out in visible form when it burns, the soul must become visible. If it does, it will cease to be *sat*.

NOTE.

The commentators ascribe this doctrine to கவுளர் or கவுளகர் (pronounced kaula, kaulaka, or gaula or gaulaka?) and we are not able to identify who these Schoolmen are. Perhaps they are Saktas.

The same.

12. If you say again that the *atma* is RupâRupa (form and formless) like the moon, then it must become visible to our eye at some moment. If you reply that this visible body itself is the product and manifestation of *atma*, then the *atma* can never become freed of *Bhanda*, it becomes *achit* and material.

NOTE.

One commentator ascribes the purvapaksha views stated in the last four stanzas to a section of the Pancharatris.

Patanjala's doctrine. Soul is Arupi and inactive.

13. If you state that the soul is *Arupi* (formless) and inactive or (unchangeable) like Akas, then explain why does the soul, becoming bound in bodies, makes it undergo all sorts of motions such as walking, &c.

The views of Vaisheshika, Purva Mimamsaka and others. Is soul Achit, Chitachit or chit?

14. If soul is *Achit* (non-intelligent) then it can have no cognition at all. If it is *chitâchit*, then, also what is chit cannot become achit, and *vice versa*. It connot be achit in one part, and chit in another part. If again, another asserts that it is not achit, but chit, then why is it, that it has no cognition except in union with the body.

NOTE.

Matter is intelligent, soul is intelligent, God is intelligent. But all these are of different planes, and the lower one pales and is considered non-intelligent in the presence of the superior one. And the soul in particular receives light from both sides from matter and from God. Soul is luminous but not self-luminous. It cannot illuminate but can be illuminated.

Pancharatri's doctrine. The soul is Anu, or atomic?

15. If the soul is said to be *Anu* or atomic, then it can pass away easily from the body by any of its outer passages. It cannot be kept up in the body. It cannot bear burdens and sufferings. It will be reducing it to the level of material atoms which are Achit. Even as an atom, it will have an organism and accordingly it will be perishable.

The same. The soul occupies place in the body?

16. If you say that the soul is located in some portion of the body, then it becomes limited like a form, and hence becomes perishable; and its intelligence cannot be felt all over the body. If you instance lamp and its spreading light, even then the soul will only cognize the things nearest it, as the lamp can burn only things near it. Else, as light, its intelligence must be felt through every sense at the same time.

NOTES.

Sivagnanayogi also points out that the analogy is wrong, inasmuch the soul and its intelligence are related as Guni and Guna, whereas there is no such relation between the flame and its light. He points out that light is but particles of the flame and is one with it; and the flame as such can be dissipated.

Of course, it is an old and well-rooted fallacy that mind can fill matter or space. The two are utterly contrasted; mind is the unextended and matter the extended. How can the unextended fill the extended? It can only do so, if it was also the extended, i.e., matter. But mind is present in all and every part of the body, and the nature of this connection is what is really mysterious. The analogy of vowel and consonant is what gives us the barest idea of the nature of this connection.

The Jaina's Doctrine. The soul is all over the body?

17. If you state that the soul is spread over the whole body and thus cognises, then it must not undergo sleep and other *Avastas*. Besides, it must understand through all the senses all at once. Then the intelligence must be more or less in proportion to the largeness or smallness of the body. Then, again, it must decrease as some one or other organ is cut off and, it must vanish when the whole body vanishes also.

The Purva Mimansaka's Doctrine. The soul is Vibhu.

18. If you say the soul is all pervading then you must explain how it is that the soul undergoes the five *avastas* and enters hell and heaven and how it cannot perceive all things all at once; and how it can know other things when it knows only through some one sense or other.

The same. Maya conceals the soul?

19. If you say the soul's intelligence is covered by the dirt of maya, then it must derive no knowledge through the senses and and antakarana. Then even the freedom from Bandha will not induce mukti. If he was the ever free and the self-luminous, he can undergo no bondage.

NOTE.

If the ever free entered into bondage, the same causes will operate to bring it into bondage even after it attained to moksha once. If it was all pervasive, it cannot get limited. If it did this of its own sweet will and pleasure, then the bondage and limitation is only a name and not a reality. And it can restore itself to its pristine purity at any moment. Then again the distinctions between purity and impurity, right and wrong, sin and virtue, good and evil, truth and falsehood, must also be nominal. No one need be advised to follow the true and avoid evil, no one need be advised to practise self-abnegation and *sadana chatustayam*, follow a guru and perform tapas and worship God. The monstrous results of this doctrine will be patent to everybody except to those whose vision is completely obscured by blind prejudice. The schools reviewed above postulate soul and maya or prakriti merely and they omit all consideration of another factor namely *anava* or *avidya* which covers and limits the soul. Hence the defect in their doctrines. It is this *anava* which limits or covers, and the *maya* it is that tries to lift the veil little and little, as the lamp lights us in darkness, but is of no use in the broad day. Having stated and met the theories of other schools, the author now proceeds to state his own position.

Soul's real nature. It is Arupi, Viyapi and Pasu.

20. It is formless (Arupa) and all pervasive (Vibhu) but unlike that of achit or matter. Its Vyapaka consists in becoming one with the thing it dwells in for the time being (body or God). Its eternal intelligence and power is eternally concealed by the *Pasa*, (bondage) *Anava Mala* and hence called *Pasu*.

Its different maya coats and their effect.

21. Entering the womb of maya (Asuddha) it regains dimly its intelligence, will, and power. Putting on the further coats of Kala, Râga, and Viddei, it shines

in particular bodies. Further donning the cloak of the three *gunas* and their products such as *antakarana* &c., it perceives in advaita union with the same.

NOTE.

These constitute its *guna sarira*, *kanchuka sarira*, and *karana sarira* according to one classification.

Its pilgrimage.

22. The soul quits a *súkshuma sarira* and lives in a *sthula* body, and continues in the five Avastas, and becomes born and born again, and performing good and bad works, it enjoys the fruits thereof.

The five kosas.

23. The five kosas are Anandamaya, Vignanamaya, Manomaya, Pranamaya, Annamaya. Of these one is more subtle (Sükshuma) than the one that follows it. And these all are evolved from their first cause Maya. The formless *atma* found in these five kosas lives in and out of it.

NOTES.

Each one of these kosas is mistaken for the *atma*. The materialist mistakes the *annamaya* kosa for the soul. The Jain mistakes the Pranamaya for the soul. The *Ahankara* vadi mistakes the Manomaya as the soul. The Buddha mistakes the Vignanamaya as the soul. And the Vedanti (idealist) mistakes the *Anandamaya* as the soul. Commentators identify the Anna and Pranamaya kosas with the Sthula Sarira, Manomaya kosa with the *Sukshuma* body, and Vignana and Anandamaya kosas with the Karana Sarira. Sivagnana Yogi identifies these five kosas respectively with the Sthula, Sukshuma, Guna, Kanchuka and Karana Sarira as defined in stanzas 21 and 22.

When the soul identifies itself with Annamaya kosa it is within it. When it ascends to the Pranamaya kosa and cognises the Annamaya as different from itself, it gets out of it and so on. Be it noted particularly here that the highest condition postulated by Vedantis as Anandamaya, where the atma is in its own place, is but an experience derived by the soul at its first contact and co-ordinate evolution with matter or maya. What rises even above this is the Siddhanti's soul or Jiva or Pasu or atma and above this and on a higher plane dwells the Supreme Brahman, Siva.

How these kosas are moved?

24. The soul lives and moves and has its being in these respective bodies, as the car and charioteer, as the playing dolls and the showman, as the masked man, as the Yogi in another body, as the actor and his different parts.

NOTE.

It will be seen the identification and subjection of the man to his part is less and less as you ascend up; and in the charioteer he has full control over the car he guides and for his own benefit.

The atma or soul is different from the body.

25. Your body is different from yourself as you say, 'my body' 'my senses,' 'my karana' 'my buddhi' &c., inasmuch as you also say 'my house' 'my cattle' &c., what you considered as inseparable from you, you find to be severed as your hairs and nails.

A further argument.

26. When you clothe yourself in silks and adorn yourself with jewels and flowers, you are not conscious that these are different from you. But when they are removed from you, you become conscious of the difference. Just so, know thyself to be different from your body.

Soul is different from Vignana and Anandamaya Kosas.

27. I understand that the body (first three kosas) is not myself; but how can you say that my *understanding* (Vignana, physical consciousness) is different from myself? Inasmuch as you say (my understanding.) But we say also 'my *soul*.' He who has really perceived the soul will not say 'my soul.' It is the ignorant who say so.

The meaning of "my soul."

28. By *lakshana* also we speak of the *Buddhi* as *manas*, and *manas* as Buddhi; we speak of chitta as jiva, and jiva as chitta; we speak of atma as God, and God as atma (soul). So also the phrase 'my soul' denotes another. namely the supreme soul dwelling in your soul.

Some language fallacies in common usage.

29. The understanding, body, *chittam*, &c., are one and all called *atma* (in the upanishads) as we speak of the burner (விளக்குத்தண்டு) as the light itself (விளக்கு). All these senses &c., are different in their action; and inseparably united to them the soul cognises them as object. The object அறிப்பொருள் is separate from the subject (அறிவது).

The five avasthas.

30. The soul who cognises through the external senses dreams in sleep and sleeps soundly with but bare breath and without action or enjoyment; and waking again, recalls its dreams, and feels its sound sleep and then enters into eating and exercises. This is the way the soul cognises through the five avastas, with the aid of the physical vestures.

Soul is not self-luminous.

31. If the soul was self-luminous then why does it require the aid of senses and organs. As the soul is concealed eternally by Anava, its intelligence is restored by the physical senses &c. Its relation to its senses and organs is like that of the king to his *ministers*.

End of 2nd Adikarana.

J. M. N.

(To be continued.)

SANKARA'S COMMENTARIES ON THE UPANISHADS*

It is a matter for congratulation that the outlook of the students of Indian Monism is growing more and more promising. Dr. Deussen is coming forward with his magnificent treatise on the history of philosophy in which it is his intention to trace to its primal beginnings, what in after times turned out to be such a wonderful engine of influence in Sankara's hands. And the German Vedantin in his "Sechzig Upanishads des Veda" has done a signal piece of service to all Sánkarins by bringing together all the Upanishads that should prove excellent auxiliaries in construing that somewhat abstruse system which is at once a closely-reasoned metaphysics and a devotional theology. The translation of *Siddhanta-lesa-sangraha* of Appayya Dikshit has been recently announced by Messrs. Lazarus of Benares and parts of it have already appeared in the Benares journal, *The Pandit.* As our readers may be aware, it is a precious Advaita work passing in review every philosophical system prevalent in India during his time, and establishing Sankara's as the only cult that could satisfy both the head and the heart. But lamentably enough, Appayya's position has generally been grossly misunderstood by Agama-Vadins, about which we propose to speak on a future occasion. And Mr. Mahadeva Sastry's activities are too well known to need any special mention; his translations of the minor Upanishads with the Advaita glosses are gems in every respect, and we note with pleasure his attempts to make popular the teachings of such revered apostles of the monistic faith as Surèswara, Vidyaranya and the rest. The Englishing of the Taittiriya Upanishad with its commentaries by Sankara and his followers is undertaken in a very scholarly style, and three parts of it have already been given to the world. And the volumes of translations of Sankara's commentaries on the *Katha Prasna* and *Chhandogya* forming volumes II. III. and IV. of Mr. Seshacharri's series, of which this paper is a review, reached completion only a few months back. We are informed that the Brihad-Aranyaka and the Svetaswatara are in an advanced state of preparation, and with their publication added to the extant translations on the Isavasya and the Mandukya from the pen of Mr. Vasu and the late Mr. Dvivedi respectively, we can say a goodly part of the Upanishad portion of the Prasthana-traya has been made accessible to the English-reading public. Of course, it is needless to mention that on the side of the Brahma-Sutras and the Gita, Sankara has long been familiar to English readers through the labours of Messrs. Thibaut and Mahadeva Sastri.

Now, coming to the subject of this notice, we need not say more about the translation of Sankara's commentaries on the Katha and Prasna Upanishads forming the second volume of Mr. Seshacharri's series than that it is the work of the same gentleman who has done the first volume already reviewed in our pages and that there is nothing to add to or take away from our remarks therein made.

But we must confess to a strong sense of disappointment when we come to the volumes of the Chhandogya. Mr. Jha was already well-known by his translations of Vijnanabhikshu's *Yogasarasangraha*, Vachaspati Misra's *Sankhya Tattva Kaumudi* and the *Kavyaprakasa*, the first two of which would fairly have taxed a translator's powers. And it was but fair to expect that one who had ventured to grapple with those works should at least be capable of rendering Sankara's commentary with accuracy and fidelity, if not indeed with grace and ease. For, the value of Sankara's gloss consists mainly in its being an interpretation of the Upanishads from the point of view of his Advaitic philosophy, however much such a proceeding may be prejudicial to what to our ideas may seem a true interpretation, and quite independently of the fact that without his aid many a passage would be almost hopelessly meaningless. To this end Sankara was necessitated, not only by his own native bent of mind, but from the vicissitudes of his avowed purpose, viz., that of reconciling all the seemingly contradictory texts and of formulating in accordance rather with their general trend of thought than with their mere words, a noble and an organic philosophy, to be precise and exact in the choice and definition of his words, and to modify somewhat in sense certain words of the philosophical terminology already existing. The necessity thus becomes apparent that the translation should be primarily literal, giving the original technical terms alongside of their renderings whenever it is expedient, and that ideas of elegance should not be allowed to interfere in a manner that would frustrate this object on which the value of the translation as such depends.

We are sorry to say however, that our translator cannot be congratulated upon the way in which he has achieved this point of accuracy. Not only is the rendering in many of the controversial portions very free, so free indeed sometimes that one cannot hope to get any clear and definite ideas from it, but what is a far more serious mistake the translator has been so grossly careless that not unfrequently the English is such as to convey the very opposite of what the original means. We may perhaps give the benefit of the doubt to Mr. Jha and opine that the printer is the more responsible party, though this by itself can never count for anything as an excuse; but we are constrained to lay the whole blame on the

* *The Upanishads—Vol. II. Katha and Prasna—translated by S. Sitarama Sastri,* B.A.—*Vols. III and IV. Chhândogya, translated by Pandit Gangánathá Jhâ,* M.A. F.T.S.—*Published by V. C. Seshacharri,* B.A., B.L., M.R.A.S.

translator when it is found that four times at least, (all detected on the first running glance over the book), the negative particle (*na* in Sanskrit) has been systematically ignored, under such circumstances, that if it had been noticed the construction of the translated sentences must have been entirely different.[1] In some places whole sentences have been omitted, a few running to three or four lines[2] even. As if to compensate for the space we have some words from Anandagiri put in along with Sankaras's words, such that without the Sanskrit edition one would naturally put them to the credit of Sankara himself.[3] We do not know what grievous sin the poor much-abused *Smritis* have committed that they should be so ignominiously ejected in favour of the Sruti, though the sentence by that process would make but a meaningless jumble. On p. 79. Part I., Sankara states the purva-paksha view that performance of the *Srauta* Karma leads men on the Northern Path or the Path of Light, while following the *Smarta* Karma conducts one to the Southern Path or the Path of Smoke[4]. Instead, in the translation we find a contrast drawn between Karma prescribed in the Sruti and that prescribed in the Veda. At first sight one is apt to be considerably bewildered by what appears to be a very subtle distinction, too subtle for us poor readers, but on which seem to hang the extremely

[1] I shall give the references. Pt. I p. 33. line 5; p. 255, l. 3; Pt. II p. 72. l. 1; p. 211. l. 10., p. 217. l. 11. On. p. 51. l. 2. (Part II) the sentence as translated means exactly the reverse of what the original intends to convey, through the mistaken substitution of *denied* for *said*. One would think from this that the author does not understand the use of a double negative in English. The word *conscious* at. p. 61. line 17 of Part II must be *unconscious*.

[2] Pt. I p. 36. l. 4; p. 233. After line 8 (about three sentences); Pt. II p. 373. line 18. (about 3 sentences). It may be that this is due to the translator having followed a different edition from that I use, which is the Anandasrama one. Even if it were so, the entire trouble must be laid to the charge of the translator who has not cared to mention the edition he has followed.

[3] The seven lines on P. 10 of Part II, from 3 to 10 are taken bodily from Anandagiri's gloss. There is nothing in the translation to distinguish this. The clause 'the author of the Vritti among others' put within brackets on p. 147. l. 17 of Part II is Anandagiri's again, not Sankara's. But possibly the translator might have thought that the brackets were a sufficient indication of the words not being due to Sankara. But this charitable view will fall to the ground when it is seen that on p. 155. line 1, and p. 163. l. 11, the brackets serve no such purpose. It may be observed that in the first two volumes, brackets are introduced only to mark off parenthetical clauses, and are not left to perform the heterogeneous functions to which they are condemned in the last two. We may conveniently put together in this place Sankara's references to previous teachers, a very rare thing with him, for the convenience of those of our readers who may be interested in the matter. For the significance of these references, our readers must be referred to Max Muller's *Six Systems of Indian Philosophy* where there is some discussion of the subject. The Vrittikara, who is generally quoted only to be disagreed with, is said by the commentators on Sankara's Bhashya to be referred to in the following places:—

Chandogya Upanishad Bhashya—under I. 2-10. (Anand. Ed. p. 25.)
— „ II. 23-1. („ „ p. 104
— „ IV. 2. 3. (An. Ed. p. 185) Sankara himself refers to "Achàry) as-" The commentator does not say to whom it points.

Brahma Sutra Bhashya—under I. 1-23. (An. Ed. p. 137).
— „ I. 1-19. The explanation given in the first part of the commentary is attributed by Govindananda to the Vrittikara.
— „ I. 2-23.—Govindananda says that the Vrittikara is here controverted. This Vrittikara is commoniy believed to be the same person as the Bodhayana, whose verbose and lengthy Vritti on the Brahma Sutras Ramanuja professes to have closely followed in his Sribhashya, of which in fact he claims his work to be merely a convenient and handy summary. It is doubtful if this Bodhayana can be identified with the author of the Kalpa-Sutra.

There is a reference, I think, to the Vrittikara in the Kena Upanishad Bhashya, but I now forget the place.

Dramidácháraya, an ancient commentator on the Brahma Sutras, is understood by Anandagiri to be followed by Sankara in his interpretation of a certain passage in the Chhandogya Upanishad (III. 8) involving much Pauranic astronomy of a fanciful and mythological character.

Under I. 3. 28. (An. Ed. p. 285), Sankara himself quotes by name with great respect Bhagavad Upavarsha, who is supposed to be the earliest commentator on the Brahma Sutras on the Advaitic side. The same person is referred to along with Sabara, the earliest commentator on the Purva Mimamsa Sutras and whose work is still extant, in discussing the Vaiyakarana theory of *Sphota* as elaborated by Patanjali. This Max Muller has shown is considerably similar to the *Logos* theory of Greece, surviving into modern times in the Christian Trinity through the gospel of St. John, to which we may add our Missionary friends give a wide berth. Strange to say Anandagiri in his gloss on this passage (III. 3. 53. Anand. Ed. p. 947.) mentions Upavarsha as the Vrittikara, a fact quite opposed to the common theory that that designation was applied only to Bodhayana. We cannot at present say what significance ought to be attached to this passage of Anandagiri's.

[4] The very same mistake again recurs on p. 87. l. 2 and p. 215. l. 1. Part I. The distinction between the two Karmas is this. Srauta Karma is that prescribed in the Vedas, viz. sacrifices, which form the principal subject of the Mantra as well as the Brahmana. Smarta Karma is that prescribed by Smriti or tradition, viz. such of household and other ceremonies as are now found embodied in the Grihya Sutras. The point is that the former have distinct Vedic authority on which to rest, while the latter is *custom* pure and simple.

momentous issue of return or non-return to this mad whirl of a Samsara, of either bondage or deliverance. These are merely a few of the mistakes of commission of a graver kind. As regards minor ones their name is legion, and we can only hope, in order that our readers may be spared, to give a few taken at random here and there. Instances there are which seem to point in only one direction, viz., that the translator could not have made out the bearing of the Sanskrit passages. We have a glaring example on p. 355 (Pt. II) where, by a curious chance, the same word which occurs twice with the interval of a few lines, are given diametrically opposite meanings[5]. And if we may judge by a passage in his book[6] we must think the translator has no idea of what a *vedi* is. It is, as every Brahmin must know, the sacrificial altar; and 'alms given outside the *vedi*' can only mean that not given in connection with a sacrifice. It is difficult to find out how he has made the phrase to mean "alms given outside the house." Here is a sentence which we may defy any of our readers to decipher. "...all longings have an end within themselves, like the *Akasa*, like the wind produced by lightning, and like the fire with all its fuel burnt off."[7]. This curious piece of "natural philosophy" which Mr. Jha here spontaneously invents can only be put on a par with Sankara's idea of the female crane conceiving without a male[8]. It is too late in the day to assert that wind is produced by lightning. The true translation would be this; "...like the lightning into the Akasa, like the breeze into Vayu, and like the fire into the burnt-off fuel, all desires have an end within the Atma." The idea is that just as the lightning flashes for a moment across the Akasa, rising from it and disappearing within it, these desires also originate from the Atman, overspread and dim its pure radiance for an infinitesimally short space of time, and then disappear within their own cause. A havoc has been made in the translation of this magnificent simile. On page 147, Part II, we have this truly astonishing statement. "Because the mind is fastened to *Prana*—*i.e.* the mind being the substratum of the Deity pointed to by *Prana*;—the mind indicates the human soul." It is philosophy with a vengeance to make the mind the substratum of the Deity. Sankara would have stood aghast to find himself paraded under this garb. The real version would be, "Because the mind is fastened to *Prana*, the mind having as substratum the Deity, for which the word Prana is applied in the text, it indicates the human soul (Jiva)."[9]

All these mistakes seem to be due to a misunderstanding or a non-understanding of the text. A good many more owe their origin to a careless and inexact use of the English Language. This now and then lands Mr. Jha in splendidly ludicrous utterances such as this choice bit. "By *Food* is only meant an accessory, an appurtenance; and they (people who perform sacrifices, who are said in this Upanishad to become, after their death, food for the Gods)[10] are not literally swallowed up by the Gods; the fact is that they become the appurtenances of the

5 The expresaion is *Bahir-vishaya-apahrita-chetasah*, which is first translated 'with their minds withdrawn from external objects.' A few lines below the same expression comes out as "having their minds conquered by the external objects of the world." We are conscious that Sanskrit *samasa* will very easily allow this twisting; but a translator can surely exercise a little appreciation of the context and some modicum of judgment.

6 Part II, p. 49, l. 6. Here Sankara comments upon the word *ishtâpûrté*, explaining *ishta* as sacrifices, and *pûrta* as works of public utility. The next word *datta* means alms, and since alms given at a sacrifice form part of it, Sankara excludes it from *datta*, and explains it to be alms given outside the *vedi* or sacrificial altar. In the translation this distinction is entirtly lost.

7 Part II. p. 270. fifth line from bottom.

8 Sankara speaks of this as being well-known. Vide Brahma Sutra Bhashya under III. 1. 19. In his Bhashya on II. 1. 25, he explains that it conceives on hearing the sound of thunder.

9 We may here put together a few more mistakes. It is the first time we hear of a '*caste* of the dice.' This spelling occurs about twenty times. Pt. I. p. 249. The Gayatri does not consist of four feet of four syllables each. If Mr. Jha had only taken the trouble to count the syllables of the mantra which as a Brahman he ought surely to know, he would have found 24. It consists according to the Upanishad of four feet of six syllables each. This is a fanciful idea introduced for the purpose of bringing the Gayatri also alongside of the other things the Upanishad mentions having a fourfold character. Really it consists of three feet of eight syllables. In Yoga books a fourth foot is said to exist which could not be pronounced, but which is to be meditated upon in one of the highest stages of Yoga. The idea of the fourth foot is most probably due to the Brihad Aranyaka, in which it is said that it could not be obtained by any body. (V. 14. 4-6.) The Sutasamhita, on the other hand, seems to take a middle course. It says that the Gayatri can be divided either into three feet of eight syllables, or into four feet of six syllables each, the former being employed in *japa* and the latter in *puja*. (Yajna-Vaibhava-Khanda. (Ad. 6. Sl. 7.) There is a mistake on the very first page. The goal of both the paths, that of Light and that of Smoke is said to be Brahma. The fact is that the goal of the latter is Chandraloka, and Brahmaloka is only to those who proceed by the path of Light. Here again is a sentence which is the acme of nonsense, "the serene Being, the human soul, being reduced by Ignorance to identity with the self—etc." Thus Sankara is made to pronounce the highest state of his own philosophy to be due to Ignorance. All this confusion results from translating *S'ari'ra* as 'Self.' (Part II. p. 357). Again, the sentence beginning on line 3 of p. 359. (Part II) is absurd. On p. 48. (Part II), "ending in the *Satyaloka*, outside the Artery" should be "ending in the Satyaloka, *not* outside the *Anda* or universe." Another bad mistake is at p. 58. line 10 of Part II; 'the exit from' ought to be struck out; the idea is that exit from the condition of the corn is extremely difficult; but still more difficult is the obtaining of a connection with procreating agents.

10 These are *my* words.

Gods, in the shape of women, cattle and the like." (P. 50. Part II). The unsophisticated reader would no doubt at once imbibe the idea that venerable Dikshits undergo on their death, the very undignified process of transformation into women for the dubious purpose of enjoyment by the Gods, that some of them are even unceremoniously turned into four-footed beasts of the field for a like end, reduced apparently to the helpless state of the too much requisitioned but unfortunate Aja (goat), which was the means of the *dikshits'* migration to the happy realm of the Gods. This somewhat elaborate joke, forced thus unwittingly upon the unfortunate commentator, he would have made all haste to disavow. Even the placid soul of a *sannyasin* would have been tossed as by a thunderstorm at this unseasonable sarcasm aimed at the solemn process of 'spiritual *ecdysis*' of our cumbrous *dikshits*, being fathered upon himself thus clandestinely. The very innocent object of the commentator was only to show that it was not meant that Dikshits were really eaten of the Gods, but that they were spoken of as food in that they conduced to the enjoyment of the gods, just in the same sense as women, cattle etc., which a man possesses are metaphorically called his food in ordinary usage. He proceeds in this quite harmless manner, when Mr. Jha would perforce clap this absurdity upon his unwilling shoulders.

It would seem to any reflecting man that the doctrine of Karma as enunciated by Hindu religious books was the very best antidote to the shallow fatalism common enough among the masses of every country. And it is a striking feature indeed of Hindu society, which seems to gather within its capacious and elastic bosom all manner of opinions under the sun, and withal by such queer juxtapositions and mutual jostlings so to round them off as to make them very accomodating indeed to each other, that in spite of the momentum gathering during ages of this doctrine, the words readiest upon the Hindu's lips are "good or bad fortune," words expressive of that bad species of fatalism which can find no law or order in the universe. Curiously enough, Mr. Jha in his thoughtless translation of a passage[11] puts these two tendencies in the sharpest and most illogical contrast thus; "then by some stroke of good fortune due to some of his past deeds, he (the person desirous of Moksha) obtains a sympathetic person, knowing the true Brahman (as Guru)." It is a wonder how Mr. Jha unnecessarily brought in this glaring contradiction, especially as the original puts the disciple's good deeds as the direct cause of his finding a true Guru. Mr. Jha wonderfully again hits the nail right on the head when he says, "In fact there is no difference of time between the reaching of true self and the reaching of perfection."[12] Precisely so, nothing can be truer; for both mean the same thing. Only he has put in "the reaching of perfection" in place of "the falling off of the body" which is found in the original. Probably in Mr. Jha's opinion, shuffling off one's mortal coils would constitute the height of perfection.

Amid this complex mass of weltering confusion it would be idle to expect any uniformity or appropriateness in the rendering of technical terms or terms used in restricted or peculiar senses. The word *jiva*[13] is rendered in one place as the "living self," and in another as "the human soul;" *chetana*[14] is variously "animate" and "intelligent," *sruti*[15] sometimes appears as "scripture," at other times as *sruti* itself. The word *Purusha* is made to figure as 'Man,' in a few places as *person*, and rarely as *purusha* itself. There is no objection to the word 'person' which is the usual one, though that too is somewhat inappropriate to denote the *jiva* in its pristine purity, as freed from the bondage of Mâya, but it is strange that the translator has pitched upon *Man*, which is the least expressive of the ideas and associations connected with *purusha*. No reason can be divined why the Sanskrit word which has been used by himself without any explanation so many times, should thus be made to transform itself proteus-like. As the passages stand, one cannot suspect that both *person* and *man* are meant to denote only one word. The best thing to be done under such circumstances would have been to give the Sanskrit expression side by side with the rendering. It is in this matter only that the most unreasoning parsimony as regards space has been allowed free play. Surely none would have been the worse for a little clearness gained at the cost of four or five pages more added to a volume. When in the first two volumes this plan has been followed to a great extent, we cannot understand

11 Part II, p. 176 line 3.

12 Part II. p. 177. line 1.

13 Once it is translated as *life*, a word which usually is made to stand for *prana*. Here it has been changed, and for *prana* there is *breath*.

14 The word comprises in itself the three ideas of intelligence consciousness and life. It thus partly resembles the conception of modern scientific monism, which regards consciousness and intelligence as being present, at least in a rudimentary and potential form, even in the lowest organised beings. This monism would also say that the potential existence of such faculties must be assumed in the inorganic world also.

15 The incongruity of the rendering will be clearly seen by looking to the etymology of the words. *Sruti* is that which has been *heard*; *scripture* is that which has been *written*.

why the same thing should not have been done in these also.[16]

The word *Brahma*, any one, even but cursorily acquainted with the Vedanta will know, bears two totally distinct significations. When it is used in the neuter gender, it denotes the impersonal and one Atman, while as a masculine it stands for the creator of manifested forms, Prajapati, the third person of the Hindu Trinity. In order to mark this distinction clearly, it had been usual to employ *Brahman*, the crude base, for the former, and *Brahma* for the latter. The whole distinction is completely lost in these two volumes and without the aid of the original it would be a matter of guess-work what *Brahma*, which is the word used throughout, is meant to represent in each individual case.

Theosopical literature is especially rich on the natural history of the astral and devachanic planes, and in its recondite nomenclature it may well vie with the epoch-marking labours of Linnæus himself ; and Mr. Leadbeater, who seems to be the great authority on this subject, bids fair to out-Linnæus even Linnæus. But it could not have been thought for a moment that a merciless pelting of the reader with quasi-erudite terms would contribute to the clearness of his comprehension. A host of strange and fearful *elementals* stare him in the face where he would gladly have met the old familiar *Bhutas*. Mr. Jha might well have presumed that a few benighted individuals might be straying, who had not caught the faintest odour of theosophy.

It is a fruitless quest to search after elegance of language in this work, especially since even a person with a good and easy command of English would find himself altogether non-plussed by Sankara's almost algebraic style. The only fruit of the endeavour would be the picking up of such absurd words as *worshipability*, copied probably from Coleridge who must be given the credit of having attempted, happily in vain, to enrich the language with such ungainly and misshapen words, and such vulgarisms as *big men*.[17]

Mr. Jha's attempts at scientific expression are not as happy as can be wished. This is the first time we hear of the *ovule* of a woman (Part II. p. 150). The fatal objection to this word is that it is a purely botanical term and can never be applied to the animal kingdom, and even in botany it has been so much objected to as disguising the genetic relationships of the organ so named, that it is now quietly dropping out of use. The word for which Mr. Jha mistook this, is probably *ovum*. But here again the idea conveyed by *sonita* in the original can never be expressed by *ovum*, for the very simple reason that the Hindus had no idea of the latter. Their theory was this, that corresponding to the seminal fluid in man, is the catamenial flow which they supposed to be the reproductive element in the woman ; and by the combination of the semen and the blood (for *sonita* means nothing else than blood), a bubble-like thing called *budbuda* is formed, which develops gradually into the child.[18] If the translator had only proceeded straight on by his mother-wit instead of hankering after learned expressions, he would have saved himself from this absurdity.

A small matter which would have saved the reader a good deal of wearisome search might have been attended to. With the modern facilities, it would have been a very easy matter to supply the references to quotations from the Sruti, as has been done in the translation of the Sri Kantha Bhashya appearing in our journal. Col. Jacob's Concordance at one's elbow would have been sufficient.

16 We might as well mention here one point on which there is some doubt. The word *Pundarika* (I. 5. 7.) which the eyes of the Purusha in the sun is said to resemble, is translated by Mr. Jha as "the red lotus" and *Kapyasa* (the ischial callosities of the monkey according to Sankara) which qualifies *pundarika* seems to bear out his view. Against it is the other fact that Amara and other lexicographers make it the name of the white lotus. The Suta Samhita copies the Upanishad verbatim (Gnanayogakhanda 19. 7) and evidently takes the lotus to be red and *kapyasa* to refer to the monkey. Max Muller on the other hand translates *pundarika* as the *blue* lotus and thinks that *kapyasa* was probably originally the name of some flower which was forgotten in Sankara's time. Sankara is at considerable pains to show that no disrespect is shown by this comparison, for the Purusha's eyes are not directly compared to the *kapyasa*, but only, he says, to the lotus. Probably Sankara took his explanation from the Suta Samhita. This passage in the Samhita is one of the few instances where a Purana does not spoil a text in the quoting. A good example of the latter process will be found in the words '*Tad vishnoh paramam padam.*' "This is the highest place of Vishnu" occurring in the Vaishnava mantras of the Rig Veda. In the Mandala Brahmanopanishad this is applied to the Manolayasthâna or place of the dissolution of the mind and so far the sentence has improved its status. (Curiously this same sloka is found in the Uttaragita and is quoted as from it in the enigmatic Raja Yoga Bhashya ascribed by some to Sankara. This Bhashya can almost be said to be a paraphrase of the Mandala Brahmana Upanishad and the strange thing is, it never thus avows itself and this sloka also seems against such a theory). In the Puranas, the Brihannaradiya for instance, it has become such a meaningless formula that it promises the self-same highest place of Vishnu as a reward for watering a *tulsi* plant. Can there be a greater proof than this of the decay of the intellect ultimately sliding into unmeaning ceremonialism?

17 Part II. pp. 68 and 312. This is a novel use of *enliven*, "The living self ceased to *enliven* the branch." The word meant is probably *animate*. On p. 87 (Part I) by a small misprint, "the *Udgitha* of the dogs" has become elevated into "the *Udgitha* of the gods."

18 See for an account Sankarananda's commentary on the Garbhopanishad, which and the accounts in the Puranas, for instance the Vayu Purana and the Suta Samhita, are all evidently taken from Susruta, the earliest of our medical authors whose works are now extant.

But we are very glad to find at least one decided improvement in these volumes over the former ones. Whenever sentences are found requiring explanation Mr. Jha has been at pains to make them really intelligible, generally by incorporating Anandigiri's words in his translation. Even then it might be wished that he had been more liberal.[19]

We have been at such considerable pains to review the work thoroughly, only in the hope that in a second edition which must sooner or later appear, these errors may be corrected and the omissions supplied, and that the book may then take its place as a standard translation of Sankara. For though there are numerous versions of the Upanishads, Mr. Seshacharri's series is the only one that gives Sankara's commentaries in entirety and as such it is to be hoped that Mr. Seshacharriar will spare no pains to make it the enduring and permanent publication which his enlightened liberality so well deserves. It is quite true that Mr. Jha was at the very great disadvantage of being nearly a thousand miles off the place of printing and that many a mistake would not have occurred if it were otherwise. This must be borne in mind in reading this review. It is not in any spirit of paltry fault-finding that the volumes are criticised in what would look a very severe strain; and if this leads only to the Brihadaranyaka being turned off with workmanlike finish, the reviewer would feel amply repaid.

M. NARAYANASWAMI AIYAR.

THE VISION OF SIR LAUNFAL
PART FIRST.

This is a poetical piece by James Russell Lowell a celebrated American poet. It is a moral piece intended to convey the principle that alms without sympathy is not acceptable and 'the gift without the giver is bare'. The Holy supper is kept in whatso we share with another's need, not what we give but what we share. This is illustrated by a vision which Sir Launfal saw in his sleep.

19 The commentary on V. 10. 2 ends with this sentence, more enigmactical than a sibylline verse; "Thus has been explained the path of the gods, ending in the Satyaloka,—as says the mantra 'between the father and the mother etc.'" Anandagiri's lucid explanation might profitably have been inserted here. He says, the father is the devaloka, the mother is the earth, and between these two is the universe comprising the path of knowledge and the path of Karma, and these paths are not outside the *anda* or universe.

Sir Launfal is determined to go in search of the Holy grail which was the cup out of which Jesus partook of the last supper with his disciples. Before his departure however he lies down on the rushes in the pious belief that he may be blessed with a vision. He accordingly in his sleep sees a vision which contains the moral principle.

He dreams that there is a castle in the north country which is closed against the poor and is a gloomy place even in the pleasantest summer. Sir Launfal dreams that he issues out of the castle with his mail as a maiden knight to seek for the Holy grail. He sees a leper in a wretched state of body and tosses to him a piece of gold in scorn. The leper however does not accept the charity observing that charity without love is worthless gold.

The hero continues the dream and finds himself returning to his castle from his search after the holy grail. He lost his castle 'for another heir in his earldom sat.' An old, bent man, worn out and frail, he came back from seeking the Holy grail.

Now again his eyes meet the same leper and he beholds in him an image of Him who died on the tree and in his name gives charity to him. He gave him a moiety of a single crust and broke the ice on the streamlet's brink. Yet the leper was fed with fine wheaten bread and he drank red wine. Then the beggar was no longer a leper but stood before him glorified and explains the principle of giving alms effectively. He says 'This cup which thou didst fill at the streamlet for me but now is the Holy grail. This crust is my body broken for thee; This water is His Blood that died on the tree.

Sir Launfal awoke from his sleep. He then says 'The groil in my castle here is found' and gives up the idea of travelling in search of it. The castle thenceforth welcomes every wanderer and no longer scowl the turrets tall.

We shall translate each stanza in Tamil poetry as far as we can. We shall reserve the preludes to the first and second parts to the end.

I.

'My golden spurs now bring to me,
And bring to me my richest mail,
For tomorrow I go over land and sea
In search of the holy grail;
Shall never a bed for me be spread,

டாக்டர். உ. வே. சாமிநாதையர்
நூல் நிலையம்
சென்னை-600090.

Nor shall a pillow be under my head,
Till I begin my vow to keep;
Here on the rushes will I sleep,
And perchance there may come a vision true
Ere day create the world anew,
Slowly Sir Launfal's eyes grew dim,
Slumber fell like a cloud on him.
And into his soul the vision flew.

1. திருக்கின்னம்நேடவேண்டித் திசையெலாந் திரியநாளை
யிருக்கின்றே னுதலாலே யெனதங்க வடியையின்னே
பொருக்கெனக் கொணர்மினோடிப் போய்மணிக் கவசத் தோடென்
றருக்கமில் தடந்தோள்வீரர் ஐயர்லான் பாலர்சொன்னார்.

2. பற்றிய தெய்துஞ்சாறும் பஞ்சணைத் துயிலேனிங்கிப்
புற்றரை யணையேயாகப் புன்றுயில் விளைப்பேனுங்கண்
மற்றறிவார்தாம்யாரோ வைகறைத் துயிலெழாமுன்
வெற்றிகொள் கனவுத்தோற்றம் மெய்யதாய் விளையுமன்றே.

3. என்றுலான் பாலரைய ரிருவிழி யயர்தலோடும்
குன்றுறழ் மேகமென்னக் கூர்துயில் விழுங்கவன்றன்
இன்றுயில் விளக்குமெல்லை யெழுந்தது கனாத் தோற்றம்போல்
ஒன்றதன் வரலாறின்ன வாறென வுரைக்கலுற்றேன்.

II.

The crows flapped in twos and threes,
In the pool drowned the cattle up to their knees,
The little birds sang as if it were
The one day of summer in all the year,
And the very leaves seemed to sing on the trees.
The castle alone in the landscape lay
Like an outpost of winter dull and gray;
It was the proudest hall in the north country,
And never its gates might opened be,
Save to lord or lady of high degree;
Summer beseiged it on every side,
But the churlish stone her assaults defied;
She could not scale the chilly wall,
Though round it for leagues her pavilions tall
Stretched left and right
Green and broad was every tent
Over the hills and out of sight;
And out of each a murmur went
Till the breeze fell off at night.

4. போகங்கொள் வேனிலாற்குப் புகுந்ததோர் நாளேபோல
காகங்களிரண்டு மூன்றுங் கலந்தன பறந்தவாவி
யாகங்க ளளவுமூழ்கி யருந்துயி லாடுமாடு
சோகங்களின்றிக் கொள்ளச் சுகித்தபோற் பறவைபாட.

5. தருக்களிற் றழைத்தசெய்யதளிர்கள்பாடுவவேபோல
இருக்கவெய் யானுமொன்றே இவ்விடந் தனிமைகாட்டித்
தருக்குமாளிகையாயுத்ர தலத்தினிற் றயங்காதாகி
யுருக்கமில் செல்வர்க்கன்றி மற்றையோர்க் குதவாதாமால்.

6. வேனிலானரணை முற்றும் வெகுண்டுசூழ்ந்தனனேயாக
தானவன் வெய்ய போரைத்தடுத்துத்தன்னுபலத்தாலே
மானமார் போர்விளைக்க மற்றவ னுட்புகாதே
யூனமார் படையோடுட்கி யுடைந்தன னிரிந்தானன்றே.
(உபலம்=கல்).

7. சேணெலாம் விரிந்துநீண்ட சேனையோ டிறுத்தானேனும்
பேணலான் வெற்றிவெய்ய பேரரண் மதிலையேறு
தாணலானுகக் கண்ட அப்படை வெய்துயிர்த்து
நாணிலதா குமாறு கதியகால் வீசிற்றன்றே.

8. பாசறை பசுமையாகிப் படர்ந்திரு புறம்விரிந்து
தேசுறு நயனஞ்செல்லாச் சேணிடம் யாவுமற்று
மாசறு மலைகள்தோறும் மகாகாதம் வளர்ந்ததேனுந்
தேசறு மதிலைவெல்லத் திறலற்று வெய்துயிர்த்தான்.

III.

The draw bridge dropped with a seerly clang,
And through the dark arch a charger sprang,
Bearing Sir Launfal, the maiden knight,
In his gilded mail that flamed so bright
It seemed the dark castle had gathered all
Those shafts the fierce sun had shot over its wall
In his seige of three hundred summers long
And binding them all in one blazing sheaf,
Had cast them forth: so, young and strong,
And lightsome as a locus leaf,
Sir Launfal flashed forth in his unscarred mail,
To seek in all climes for the holy grail.

9. எடுக்குறு வாயில்வீழ்ந்த தெழுந்தது தண்ணெனோசை
துடுக்கென வளைந்தவாயில் துரகமொன் றதித்துப்பாய்ந்த
தெடுக்கரு புதிய வீரரிலான்பாலரையர் வந்தார்
தடுக்கரு மொளிகள்வீசுந் தயங்குபொற் கவசங்காக்க.

10. தேவரும் விரும்புமந்தத் திருக்கின்ன மெய்தவேண்டி
யேவரு மூனஞ்செய்யா விடுங்கவசத்தோடுற்ற
மேவரு மரியதோற்றம் வேனிலான் முந்நூறுண்டங்
கேவிய கிரணமெல்லா மிணைந்தரணெறிந்ததாமால்.

IV.

It was morning on hill and stream and tree,
And morning in the young knight's heart;
Only the castle moodily
Rebuffed the gift of the sunshine free,
And gloomed by itself apart;
The season brimmed all other things up
Full as the rain fills the pitcher plant's cup.

11. மலையினி லாற்றில்மற்று மரங்களின் ஐயர்வீரர்
விலையறு கவசங்காக்கு மெய்யுறு மிளையநெஞ்சில்
மலரவிழுதயவேளை மற்றரணிருண்டுவெய்யோன்
பலவென வருளும்வாளைப் பற்றில பாழ்த்தவன்றே.

12. ஓங்குவான் மழையினீரா லொள்ளிலை நிரம்புமாபோல்
தாங்கரு மோகையாலுந் தண்ணிய வொளியினாலும்
வீங்குமிவ் வுலகமெல்லாம் வேனிலா னிரப்புற்றானல்
தேங்கிய யாவுமம்மா திவ்விய படிவமுற்றே.

V.

As Sir Launfal made morn through the darksome gate,
He was ware of a leper crouched by the same,
Who begged with his hand and moaned as he sate.
And a loathing over Sir Launfal came;
The sunshine went out of his soul with a thrill,
The flesh! 'neath his armour 'gan shrink and crawl,
And midway his leap his heart stood still
Like a frozen waterfall;
For this man so foul and bent of nature,
And seemed the one blot on the summer morn,—
So he tossed him a piece of gold in scorn.

13. ஐயர்லான் பாலர்தாமு மாயிடை யுதயமாக்கி
பையவே செல்கின்றாரோர் படையுறு மெய்யன்குட்டன்
கையினா லையமேற்பான் புன்கணால் கலங்குநெஞ்சன்
மெய்யெலா மழுங்குநோயன் வெளியிடைக் கண்டாரன்றே.

14. ஆங்கவன் கண்டபோழ்தே யருவெறுப் புற்றாசெய்ய
தேங்கிய நெஞ்சின்பண்பும் தீர்ந்தனர் சுருங்குமெய்யர்
தாங்கருங் குளிரின்பண்பால் தயங்கிய வருவியோட்டம்
நீங்கியே யுறைந்தாற்போல நெஞ்சுலைக யற்றுநின்றார்.

15. குறைந்தழி மெய்யன்குட்டன் கொடுந்தொழு நோயனந்தோ
அறிந்ததே போன்றமெய்ய னலக்கணுற் றழுங்குநெஞ்சன்
செறிந்தநல் வேனிலான்செய் விழைவினைச் சிதைப்பானவன்
எறிந்தன னரும்பொன்னொன்றை யிகழ்ந்தவ னெதிரேவீரன்.

VI.

The leper raised not the gold from the dust;
'Better to me the poor man's crust,
Better the blessing of the poor,
Though I turn me empty from his door;
There is no true alms which the hand can hold;
He gives nothing but worthless gold
Who gives from a sense of duty;
But he who gives a slender mite,
And gives to that which is out of sight,
That thread of the all sustaining beauty
Which runs through all and doth all unite,—
The hand cannot clasp the whole of his alms,
The heart outstretches its eager palms,
For a god goes with it and makes it store
To the soul that was starving in darkness before.

16. குட்டனங் செறிந்தபொன்னைக் குறித்திலன் எடுத்தானல்லன்
இட்டமோ டெளியனீந்த எச்சிலே யேற்பதல்லால்
கட்ட மோடிட்ட மற்றைக்கையுறும் பொருளுமேலேன்
சிட்டமே யெளியோனுசி யென்றனன் தெருண்டநெஞ்சன்.

17. புன்பொருளேனுங் கட்குப் புலப்படாப் பொருளொன்றேனும்
வன்புல வாழ்க்கையெல்லாம் வனப்பினை யெய்தும் வண்ணம்
என்பினை யுருக்கியாவு மியக்கும்வான்பொருளாமந்த
அன்பினா னீயினன்ன தகங்கையினடங்காதாமால்.

18. அன்னதை யருத்தியோடே யங்கையை விரித்து நீட்டி
முன்னுறு நெஞ்சினோடு முடுகியேவாங்கியேற்ப
தென்ன சாரணமே யென்றாவிருளினையோட்டி நெஞ்சை
பொன்னொளி நிரப்பு மந்தப் பொருளினிற் திருவுந் தங்கும்.

T. VIRABADRA MUDALIAR, B.A. B.L.

(To be continued.)

THE PROBLEM OF EVIL—NO. IV.

19. Are virtue and vice conventionalities, we may next inquire? What are conventionalities? An argument among men that a certain thing shall be so considered or a certain course of action shall be approved as right or condemned as wrong; so that conventionalities are a set of public opinion, varying according to place, time and drift of men's likes and dislikes. And there are again conventions, particular and general, partial and universal. *Dharma* according to the Aryans is *Sâdharana* (సాధారణ) and *Asâdharana.* (అసాధారణ). In determining these, the factors of the (1) moral sense, (2) religion, (3) intuition, (4) reason and (5) congeniality, largely enter. The whole subject is however resolvable into (1) " Do to others as you would have others to do unto you and (2) the greatest amount of happiness (or comfort) to the greatest number of people." If these two rules are applied in every case where a question of whether a certain thing is vicious or virtuous has to be determined, a fairly satisfactory criterion will have been used. Thus, when a lie will save one person to the detriment of two others, it is a sin; but when it will save even one other to the detriment of his own-self it may be considered a very great virtue. Again whatever may, at the sacrifice of greater good in a period posterior, appear in a period anterior, conducive to a passing feeling of good or comfort may be said to be vice. A man might now take to drink or adultery but at sacrifice permanently of his health and capacity for a better kind of work in the order of economy, letting alone considerations of an existent soul and the enjoinings of religion that eternal welfare is involved in the small deeds of the day. Man certainly differs from a beast. He is not only not bestial, but more than a mere animal; the difference consisting in the larger sense of un-self and views of philanthrophy, implanted in his nature, which is the cause of the " conventionality." The rudimental " sniff " discerning bad from good or good from bad whatever further improvements and developments, man's advance in the scale of civilization may have brought about, is the indestructible fundamental which may be ascribed to a patriarchal Intelligence, watching and guiding the faltering steps of humanity in its immense revolutions speeding towards an ever-nearing and ever-receding goal in the distance of eternity. The wheel revolves, but the axle guides it. Man's *Karma* accounts for a great many things beyond which, the inscrutable Divinity is the only one more explanation that can be offered.

20. Now the Vedantic view of evil:—Ignorance or non-knowledge is the cause of all misery, Vedánta vociferates. And *Ajñana* (అజ్ఞాన = Ignorance) has been split into *Ajñana*, *Anyathâ-Jñana*, *Viparîtha-Jnâna* and *Jnâna-Sûnya.* Not, at present, to go into the details of this aspect of metaphysical kosmos, it is enough to state that Ignorance is the mistaking or the mis-apprehending of one thing for another. Our attachments to this perishable world, and forgetfulness of things imperishable, are said to be the outcome of ignorance, which is in turn a quality taking its rise from the envelope of matter which shrouds and mystifies its spiritual content. Emerging from out of this, or separation from the companionship of matter, is stated as the spiritual re-birth, the emancipation blooming into enlightenment; in other words dissipation of darkness, i. e., ignorance; or a state where an *absolutely* right and wrong perception of things is attained. In the last number of this series, this Vedantic view shall be exhaustively dealt with.

21. Selfishness is said to be an aspect of ignorance, and is said to be the source of much evil. Supposing, according to the theory of the "survival of the fittest," all were killed, and the final fittest (only one, it is feared) survived, what would be the estate or enjoyment of that singledom? This is the ulterior corner to which selfishness has necessarily to be driven. Philanthropy would in this order of existence be a nonentity. Selfishness and philanthropy are thus opposite terms. Selfishness has therefore been pronounced the "evil." How does it arise? " I" and " mine" are, says our Aryan philosophy, the concatenary effects of the narrow view which through ignorance, we take of our present existence, and not,—through that ignorance—extending it to the immeasureable spaces and times, towards which we are drifting; the ocean beyond the insignificant limits of a bubble coming and going on its surface. The sacrifice of " me and mine," is the *magnum opus* prescribed for perceiving and attaining true happiness. Even within the confines of this little life and this little world, the exercise of philanthropy gives one a happiness, which can at best be descrided as a foretaste of that imperishable and everlasting kind which is to come. An expansion of this " selfishness *versus* selflessness question may be anticipated at the end of this series of articles.

22. The solvent of the doubts of the moment consists in seeing beyond, the difficulty of the present situation by its relative tenuity into a future. Only then will the perplexity disappear. It is somewhere said that " *the natural world taken by itself is not a world of reason, but of unreason.* Is it not of all things most unreasonable that life should enter the world only to die? Is not nature—(*natura non contristatur* is an old experience) —the mother who unmercifully devours her offspring? Is it not unreason that so oft in the battle of existence, goodness should fall before evil, and vice maintain its triumph over virtue? Life and health are reason; death and sickness are unreason. These contradictions of exist-

ence must be familiar to all. They have often been dwelt upon, but the force of them can never be too deeply felt. "Shall we, then, pause here in our contemplation overwhelmed by a contradiction which we cannot solve? * * * * * * No. * * * * It is because it is a high life, not because it is a false life that these contradictions are known and experienced. It is the higher, seeking to burst the bonds of the lower. By all this struggle, by all this mystery, this life proclaims its greatness and its dignity."

23. The enigma of evil thus finds its solution in transcendentalism; and the sovereign remedy for all ill is the knowledge of self. If in the evolutionary design of nature, in other words, progress, a beneficient plan is seen, then progress denotes good, and retrogression evil. Progress and retrogression: not in the short span of a life, but in lives past, and lives to come. What is good and what is bad cannot therefore be determined by individual proclivity—as what is agreeable to one is not so to another; what is disagreeable to one is not so to another; what is agreeable in one place disagrees in another; and what is good in health is bad in illness—nor from the view of a mundane existence merely. As general happiness is the standard of morality, the ultimate happiness is the standard of good. Annie Besant (Anna Bhai) says: "that which promotes the general happiness is right; that which lessens or undermines the general happiness is wrong." So are good and evil to be considered together.

24. Hope in a better life promotes virtue, faith in an all-caring Providence affords the greatest solace to the sick heart, and charity (comprehending unselfishness and philanthropy) adds to the sum of human happiness here and hereafter. Self-sacrifice for a noble cause might result even in self-destruction—the greatest evil that, from a worldly point of view, can befal one—but eternal happiness will have been secured by the person hereafter, as happiness for those he secured here for whom he stood a victim is a force which perpetuates.

25. The Buddhist view of evil is very radical. Birth or descent of spirit into matter is the root of all evil. If there was no birth, there could be no death. And what causes birth? *Tamha*=Sans: (*Trishna*)=desire=attachment. When this shall cease, re-birth shall cease, and this is the mental frame the cultivation of which Buddhism prescribes. The Buddhist view is no other than the Aryan view. అనాదిమాయానుప్తః is what we have said; and అనాదిమాయా is but the ever-existent verity of matter, dissociation from which is enlightenment or Buddhahood. Ignorance is a product of matter inhering in its nature; matter itself, as certain Vedantists assert,—Ignorance meaning absence of Intelligence. Matter has before been said to have the 3 qualities of *Satva*, *Rajas* and *Tamas*, which were latent energies in the primordial *Mulaprakriti*, or *Tamas*. In the cosmogenesis of the Hindus, primeval darkness was, in the beginning of *a* creation; and to show how matter, darkness and ignorance are convertible terms, or how related or how one proceeded from another, three authorities are quoted here, (*En-passant*, the scientific "inertia" of matter may here be kept in view).

I. *Vishnu Purána, Book I. Ch. V. Sl. 5.*

(1) తమో, (2) మోహో, (3) మహామోహ, (4) స్తామిస్రో, (5) హ్యంధ, సంజ్ఞితః ॥ అవిద్యాపఞ్చపర్వైషా ప్రాదుర్భూతా మహాత్మనః ॥

From the Great Soul, appeared the fivefold Ignorance, *viz*; (1) obscurity, (2) illusion, (3) extreme illusion, (4) gloom, (5) darkness. Or:—

(1) *Tamas* (తమః), (2) *Môhâ* (మోహః), (3) *Maha Môha* (మహామోహః), (4) *Tâmisra* (తామిస్రః), and (5) *Andhatâmisra* (అన్ధతామిస్రః); and these are the five *Viparyayâs* (విపర్యయాః), or the errors of understanding impeding soul's liberation.

II. *The Sânkhya*:—In the language of Sri Parâsarabhattar. (1), (2) and (3).

(1) దేహాసక్తాత్మబుద్ధిః (*Dèh-àsakt-âtmabuddhi*). Mistaking the body for the spirit.

(2) బాంధవాభాసః (*Bándhavábhâsa*). Attachment to objects, such as wife, children &c., the idea of possession.

(3) విషయచపలః (*Vishaya-chapala*). Temptation for enjoyments of sense-objects.

(4) *Krôdha* (క్రోధ),=wrath; and (5) అభినివేశ (*Abhinivesa*) = fear of death or other loss and consequent wish to protect oneself against them.

III. *Pâtanjala* philosophy (or *Yoga*):—

The five క్లేశాః (Klesa) = afflictions, are:—

(1) అవిద్య (*Avidya*) = ignorance; (2) మమతా (*Mamatâ*) = notion of property or possession; (3) అస్మిత (*Asmita*) = the "I-am-ness"; (4) రాగ (*Râga*) = love or attachment; (5) ద్వేష (*Dvesha*) = hatred. The Buddhists are thus not alone in attributing all evil to the circumstance of birth; for the Aryans (Hindus) knew it long ago.

26. Now the Zend-Avesta (Sansk: *Sandhyávastha*) account of the evil and the gord are, that they are the necessary two sides of a picture; the bright and dark phases (something like the view of the Manicheans); the two opposite poles of the cosmic energy; the counterparts of nature's manifestation; the positive and negative

forces; the spiritualizing and materializing tendencies; the Ahura-Mazda and the Ahriman. Both these become discrete when cosmogony begins before which they were asleep in the bosom of eternity, called the *Savan-e-Akarne* Sansk., *Sayanam-akârane*, or sleep in the causeless). This Persian account is almost the same as the Vedic. Matter and spirit are the two co-eval, co-existent and co-ordinate categories, the union between which is the cause of incarceration (Samsara) and their separation, emancipation. Matter and spirit are again the female and male principles. (*Sanyâsâsrama* takes its births from this).*

27. A strictly philosophical disquisition must be wearying and a coherent discourse monotonous. Hence our treatment of the evil question in a varied manner and by paragraphs each in itself a single thought. To avoid monotony would not even a story be an agreeable relief? Such a one,-if it is a story at all-is the following, by Caleb S. Weeks of America :—

"As the Divine Love, which comes to the physical man in the warmth, and the divine wisdom, in the light, of the sunbeams, fell more directly and fully upon me, my soul was expanded and illumed by the spiritual warmth and light that accompany those rays. I breathed freely these inspirations, till a consciousness of my intimate relationship to the forms of beauty around, and to the great animating soul of nature, took such possession of my mind that for a time I forgot all else. My whole nature thrilled with the enthusiasm which seemed to inspire the birds, and I said to myself, it is good to be here,—*this* is the "Divine Temple, not made with hands;" *this* is the gate of heaven. (Compare this with the (1) *archi râdi mârga* of the Vedas, (2) the Gâyatri of fame (3) the *mantra* "అమృతయోనౌ సూర్యజ్యోతిషి" &c., (4) the అన్తరాదిత్య (*Antaraditya-Vidya*, of the Upanishads, and (5) ధ్యేయస్సదా సవితృమణ్డలమధ్యవర్తీనారాయణః &c.) "Any one viewing such a scene cannot fail to see through the illusion called death, and discover that an eternal life of love, wisdom and goodness pervades and animates all things.

"Then my thoughts reverted to the great city beyond the south-western horizon. The selfishness and nameless wrong which so greatly prevail, swaying individuals and society, producing great crops of mystery, came to my recollection, and with it the fact that the same unhappy condition existed, differing only in degree, in all human society, not excepting the beautiful country around me. A pang of wounded human sympathy and congealing aspiration shot through my being. A dark cloud passed over my spiritual horizon. A confused sense of great imperfection and evil in humanity, like a nightmare dream, oppressed me, and my soul cried out to the parent soul, O divine love and wisdom! art thou indeed infinite? Why, then, while filling all else to overflowing, with perfection and beauty, hast thou left mankind thus imperfect? Why, while all around is fragrant with love and sweetness, while the apple-trees fill the air with the perfume of their blossoms, does human nature *alone* produce such bitter fruits? Was thy perfecting skill so exhausted in producing these that *man* must be left deficient? Are all our aspirations doomed to disappointment? Are our capacities to see and appreciate these perfections *only* to make us more susceptible to pain in discovering our own lack of them? or, if thy goodness is equally embodied in humanity oh! give me the light to see it as plainly!"

An optimistic answer to this above appeal bearing out the burden of this papers' say that evil is simply in relation, and as such does not counterargue the beneficient plan of the universe and the final residue of all-goodness is given in the following allegory :—

"A moment more and the cloud passed away. The light of truth beamed more brightly than ever, and the spiritual principles or laws of nature opened more clearly to my view. They spake in a grand chorus of voices from the apple-trees, saying, "Listen, and we will expound to you a chapter from the book of life,—the correspondence of our order of development with that of humanity."

"I listened and thus they spake: "years ago each of the trees you now behold was a small seed or germ. In the womb of mother earth, nourished by her life-blood, we were enabled to develope organisms that could unfold our own individualities of life. At first we were small and feeble. But we succeeded in sending forth our roots and

* The following quotations confirm the above view :—

Bk. : I. Ch. 7. Sloka 24. (Vishnu Purana).

The good principle :—

పత్న్యర్థం ప్రతిజగ్రాహ । ధర్మోదాక్షాయణీః ప్రభుః ॥

Sl. : 32. *The evil principle* :—

హింసాభార్యాత్వధర్మస్య । తస్యాంజజ్ఞేతథానృతమ్ ॥

Sl. : 36. *The Agents of dissolution* :—

రౌద్రాణ్యేతాని రూపాణి విష్ణోర్మునివరాత్మజ ।
నిత్యప్రళయహేతుత్వం జగతోస్య ప్రయాంతి వై ॥

Sl. : 37. *The Agents of creation* :—

దక్షోమరీచిరత్రిశ్చ భృగుశ్చాద్యాః ప్రజేశ్వరాః ।
జగత్యత్రమహాభాగ నిత్యసర్గస్య హేతవః ॥

Sl. : 38. *The Agents of continuance* :—

మనవోమనుపుత్రాశ్చ భూపావీర్యధనాశ్చయే ।
సన్మార్గాభిరతాశ్శూరా స్తేనిత్యస్థితికారిణః ॥

Sl : 13. *Halfmale and half-female principle* :—

అర్ధనారీనరవపుః ॥

Sl. : 14. *The separation of the two principles* :—

తథోక్తోఽసౌద్విధా స్త్రీత్వం । పురుషత్వంతథాఽకరోత్ ॥

branches into the soil and air, and grasping our needed nourishment. For many years we had no fragrance to offer you. We were of necessity selfish,—absorbed in the effort to develope and strengthen the instruments which were to unfold the natures within us. To-day *as trees* we are so far perfected, that, as the inspiring and expanding breath of spring reaches us, we can bloom for a brief time with the flowering promise of the fragrant fruit which is to be the ultimate of our life activities. But the blosoms that so delight your senses are not that fruit,—only a prophecy which the spring-time inspirations enable us to make of the work that the summer, if favorable, will enable us to produce. A few days hence we must cast these off, and in their places you will find only hard, sour, bitter fruit, un-congenial to the taste and injurious to health. The fruit, like the tree, must for a long time be entirely selfish,—must repel other life, and give all its energies to the task of maturing its own. And we the trees, must give it all our assistance in its work. Nor can but a small proportion of these blossoms redeem the apparent promise of fruit. Many of the apples, defectively organized, with insufficient vitality to complete their organisms, must drop and yield up their life. Such ones in their falls will often strike and carry down or injure better fruit which is badly situated with reference to it. If overcrowded with fruit, we can carry but part of it to maturity and each must take much of the needed substance away from the others. If in improper soil, neglected, badly cultivated or planted too thickly we cannot afford nourishment sufficient to develop any of it properly, but must leave it all knurly and defective.

"The short-sighted observer, judging by the sensation and effects they produce when unwisely brought into contact with his vital organism, may adjudge them evil and declare false the prophesy we make to-day; but the instructed intelligence which has learned to look through the summer before us and read the law of our nature's unfolding, will see that when the fruit has accomplished the work of self-development it will cease to repel with its selfish bitterness, and will ripen into a fragrant, kindly, wealth, health-giving flavour, far superior to what the blossoms prophetically yeild to-day. The law of self-preservation and development then fulfilled in it, the higher law of self-abnegation predicted by the blossoms, will be completely unfolded in the fruit, which will bestow only pleasure to your senses and health to your body, freely yeilding up its life to any who may need it,—even bestowing fragrance on those who trampla it.

What do we learn from this leaf in the grand Book of Nature?

(1) The gradual unfoldment of the human race.

(2) The present a promise of the future.

(3) Self-abnegation, the fruit of life.

(4) Philanthropy the final object.

(5) Apparent self-dom a preparation for the final fulfilment of Universal charity.

(6) A beneficient plan throughout, with apparent dark (like the bitterness of the unripe fruit) spots here and there, which are but parts of the beneficient design than anything else.

(7) The final triumph in spite of casual catastrophes.

In Week's words:—"Thank God and nature! the period of ripening will come to our race! Human nature bears not permanent fruits of bitterness any more than do these trees. Selfishness is first in the order of unfolding; fraternal love, self-sacrificing, self-forgetting, will be the fragrance of the ripened soul. Humanity too has its spring-time of prophesy, when the unfolding love blossoms out in a transient supremacy of fragrant aspirations, then casts off its flowers that it may pursue the work of developing the self-hood, of maturing the fruit."

ALKONDAVILLI G.

(*To be continued.*)

NACCHINARKKINIYAR: A STUDY.

(*Continued from page* 46).

Is it possible to assign a lower limit to it? We are certainly not altogether without the means of doing so. The Tamil sacred books were collected and arranged into eleven groups about the middle of the eleventh century A.D., and the Tamil Vyâsa who compiled the Dravida vedas was Nambi A'ndar Nambi, a Brahman priest of Tirunaraiyur, in the Tanjore district. Mr. Sundaram Pillai, in his pamphlet *Some Milestones in the History of Tamil Literature,** maintained that Nambi Andar Nambi was a contemporary of Raja-raja Ko Parakesari Varman of the Tanjore inscriptions, and that he had written his *Antadi* before the close of the tenth century. This opinion was disputed by Mr. Venkayya, in his article on 'The age of Rajaraja Chola Deva,' and the dispute turned into an open discussion† between them as to the date of Nambi Andar Nambi. Mr. Venkayya's case may be stated in the words of Mr. Sundaram Pillai thus: "In the collection of sacred hymns compiled by Nambi Andar Nambi, there is one celebrating the temple of Gangaikonda Cholapuram, which Mr. Venkayya thinks cannot have been constructed

earlier than in the days of Râjêndra Chola (the son and successor of Râjarâja), who is the earliest Chola king known to epigraphy as having borne the title of Gangaikondon." Mr. Sundaram Pillai contended that there might have been another Gangaikonda Cholapuram in still earlier days, and subsequently appealed to a tradition to the effect that the Rajeswara shrine at Tanjore was built after the model of the one at Gangaikonda Cholapuram. It seems to me that he omitted to note the possibility that the temple at Tanjore might have been constructed on a similar plan, but that the place might have borne a different name at that early period, and that the tradition, to make the thing clearer, might have borrowed the name later on. Mr. Venkayya supported his statement by facts and figures, and successfully proved that there could not have been any other Gangaikondachola before Rajendra Chola, whose vast conquests are recorded in the *Kalingattu Parani*, the *Vikkiramacholanulâ*, and *the Kulottungacholanulâ*. But this discussion does not much affect the statement made in the opening lines of this paragraph, that Nambi Andar Nambi compiled the Dravida Vedas about the middle of the eleventh century A.D. The disputants themselves did not differ much as to the date of Nambi Andar Nambi. And they could not do so, for we must ascribe to Sêkkilar the author of the *Periya Purâna* and a contemporary of Kulottunga Chola I., the early years of the latter part of the eleventh century; and Sêkkilar, we know, was a successor of Nambi Andar Nambi in the religious field.

Now, the eleventh group of Nambi's compilations includes, among others, the *Tirumuruharruppadai*, a poem by Nakkîrar, and one of the Ten Tamil Idyls. The Ten Tamil Idyls are known collectively as *Pattuppâttu*, and they have been commented on by Nacchinârkkiniyar. If Nacchinârkkiniyar, therefore, had lived after Nambi Andar Nambi of the eleventh century, he must have noted the interesting fact of the *Tirumuruhârruppadai's* becoming a sacred book. It is not a safe position to take up that Nacchinârkkiniyar did not respect the Nambi or his compilations. On the other hand, this could only lead us to infer that Nacchinârkkiniyar must have lived before Nambi Andar Nambi. Mr. Sundaram Pillai's theory that Nacchinârkkiniyar was slow to recognise the greatness of Saiva saints and to accept their words as authoritative, cannot, as has already been pointed out, go unrefuted. The likelih od is that he had no occasion to introduce their words into his commentaries, which were purely literary. Further, the fact of the inclusion of the *Tirumuruhârruppadai* in the Dravida Vedas is historically important. The date of the inclusion marks an epoch in the history of the book, which from that day carried with it a passport for use in the daily pûjas of the Saiva Tamilians. Besides, it is idle to argue that Nacchinârkkiniyar did not think it worthy to note a fact which was immediately connected with the works in hand, and which, doubtless, created a stir in the Tamil land. Was not this fact an innovation, if not an improvement, in the way of using the *Tirumuruhârruppadai*? Thus, Nacchinârkkiniyar could not certainly have lived at or after the time when this important event came to pass and spiritualised the literary poem. That is to say, the lower limit to his age is the early years of the eleventh century A.D. This conclusion, it may be added, is favoured by the fact that no reference is found in his commentaries to Kamban and other later poets.

We have seen now that Nacchinârkkiniyar must be looked for somewhere beteen the latter half of the eighth century and the earlier half of the eleventh. Can we not be more exact regarding his date? As has been already noticed, Nacchinârkkiniyar was decidedly a commentator of the Jaina cycle. His commentary on the *Chintâmani*, by the extraordinary fertility of information about the Jaina system that it supplies, suggests that it was composed at a period when the Jain influence had not entirely lost its hold on the Tamil country. It is very improbable that Nacchinârkkiniyar, if he had lived at a later date, would have collected information on such a grand scale about the system and astonished us by filling a commentary on an epic with facts that bear more on religion than on literature. The tradition about this commentary—that he wrote one and submitted it to the approval of the Jaina pandits, that they rejected it as a wrong exposition, and that, after this insult he wrote another and gained their approbation—firmly supports our view that the Jains were exercising considerable influence during the age of Nacchinârkkiniyar. We know as a matter of fact that "by the time of Nambi Andar Nambi, *i.e.*, the eleventh century, Jainism was practically extinct in the Tamil country."* We also know as a fact that the Jain influence was at its height in the

* Page 39.

† *Madras Christian College Magazine*, November, 1896.

* *Some milestones in the History of Tamil Literature*, page 8.

age of Tirujánasambandha, and that therefore he had to encounter much opposition in resuscitating his own religion by overthrowing that of his opponents. The Pandiya king himself professed the Jain faith when Sambandhar set about his religious conquests. The Jain religion, which was so powerful in the opening years of the seventh century, and which, in consequence is referred to with contempt in the hymns of Sambandhar and Appar, had not evidently stood in the way of Sundara's achievements. [Sundara is generally assigned to the early years of the ninth century A.D. (about 825 A.D.), being connected by tradition and in the *Periya Purána* with Sêramân Perumâl, also probably the last of the Perumáls, who is said to have mysteriously disappeared from his country.], If, then, the Jain influence did not deserve the attention of Sundara of the ninth century A.D., Nacchinârkkiniyar must have flourished along with Sundara or even before his time. He might have lived also after Sundara; for while Sundara lived but eighteen years, Nacchinârkkiniyar's age approached one hundred. Thus the age of Nacchinârkkiniyar may be said to have been the latter half of the eighth century and the earlier half of the ninth. This conclusion must, however, be regarded as only tentative, though it may be pointed out that we should be treading on very slippery ground if, without reliable data, we were to shift him to any later date.

With the support of this conclusion the spurious nature of the tradition that brings Nacchinârkkiniyar in contact with Parimêlalahar, the celebrated commentator of the *Tirukkural*, can be very easily proved. The tradition has it that Nacchinârkkiniyar was present in the assembly where the *Kural* commentary was exhibited for approval, and that, on hearing the commentary of Parimêlalahar on a certain *Kural** he congratulated the latter on hitting the exact meaning. This is also stated in a slightly modified way. Some hold that the meaning controverted by Parimêlalahar was that of Nacchinârkkiniyar, and that, therefore, he acknowledged in a way the superior intelligence of Parimêlalahar. In any case, the tradition is a false one, as the age of Parimêlalahar was not earlier than the twelfth century. This date is inferred from his own commentary,† where he alludes to the works of King Bhoja, who according to an inscription lived between 1040 A.D., and 1090 A.D. But the tradition ought to be explained. It seems to have arisen from a confusion of Nacchinârkkiniyar with Nacchar, who is one of the alleged ten commentators of the *Tirukkural*. None of the eulogistic stanzas that have come down to us support the statement that the former commented on the *Kural* But the idea is found strangely recorded in books that treat of Tamil literature. The author of *The Galaxy of Tamil Poets* has no doubt about this point.* He says: "Nacchar also is a name by which Nacchinârkkiniyar was known." The modern tendency of Tamil scholars, however, is strongly opposed to any such confusion; and Pandit Swaminatha Aiyar, who indicated in his introduction to the *Chintâmani* that the *Kural* was one of the works commented on by Nacchinârkkiniyar, has, in his editions of the other classics published latter on, disabused us of that idea.

Now as to the works of Nacchinârkkiniyar. He is known to us only as a commentator, but among commentators he holds a very respectable position. Commentary in Tamil is one of the many important branches of literature and has for a long time filled the place that should rightly be given to prose composition. When every scientific treatise took the form of a poetic composition, the exposition of scientific principles was the work of commentaries. Prose unmixed with verse was, till the commencement of the century, a rare phenomenon in Tamil literature. But prose itself cannot be said on that account to be a creation of this century. It existed even in the classic age, the age of the Sangham, in Perundêvanâr's *Bhâratam* and in the *Iraiyanârahapporul* commentary. It existed in later times in the commentary of Ilambûranar and still later in the writings of Pêrásiriyar and Sênâvaraiyar. These works, however, had their defects. They were either poetical and pedantic or brief and unexpressive. Good prose writing comemenced only with Nacchinârkkiniyar, and, ever since, his works have been a model to later prose writers. His writings are voluminous, and from the only works to which an earnest student can apply himself to attain a style at once simple and clear. In the extent of his writings he excels all other commentators of the Tamil language, and his worthy to be compared with Mallinâtha Sûri of the sanskrit tongue, Even the best commentators have seldom left behind them more than one commentary. Nakkîrar has

* *Kural*, 338.

† *Kural*. Kâmattuppâl, Introduction. See also Weber's *Indian Literature*.

* Page 191.

given us only his commentary on the Ahapporul and Sênâvaraiyar commented only on the *Tolkâppiyam* Solladhikaram (Etymology). Parimêlalahar wrote only on the *Kural* and Adiyârkkunallâr only on the *Silappadhikâram.* Even among the latest, only Sivajnâna Yogi resembles Nacchinârkkiniyar to some extent Of the other prominent commentators, Mayilêrumperumal Pillai has provided us with an incomplete commentary on the *Kallâdam,* and Sankara Namassivâyar with a commentary on the *Nannûl.* But Nacchinarkkiniyar left commentaries on the *Tolkâppiyam,* the *Pattuppâttu,* the *Kalittohai,* the *Jivakachintâmani,* and the twenty stanzas of the *Kuruntohai.* Apart from this characteristic difference in the quantity of the work done by them, are the other commentators on a par with Nacchinârkkiniyar in having produced work of superior quality? By quality here is not meant the intrinsic worth of the commentaries but the nature of the books that the commentrtors chose to comment upon and the utility of the commentaries for future generations.

The *Tolkâppiyam* is the oldest of Tamil grammars, and perhaps also the best; and the only commentator who has annotated it completely is Nacchinârkkiniyar. The work is composed of three parts, Eluttu, Sol, and Porul. Of these, Eluttu corresponds to orthography, and that is commented on by Hambûranar as well as by Nacchinârkkiniyar. Sol corresponds to Etymology, and the only good commentary on it besides Nacchinârkkiniyar's is that of Sênâvaraiyar. The latter is held by some to be even superior to Nacchinârkkiniyar's, but this is a matter of opinion. Porul is the third part of the *Tolkâppiyam,* and it treats of the properties of things. Unlike the later grammarians, who regard *yâppu* (prosody) and *ani* (rhetoric) as separate parts and thus mako a fivefold division of grammar, Tolkâppiyar makes his third part include the other two. Porul itself includes two large subdivisions, Ahapporul, rules for amatory verses, and Purapporul, rules for war-chants. Ahapporul is said to have an undercurrent of sublime truth which, when interpreted, marks the different stages through which the human soul passes ere it attains final absorption into the Supreme Being. If this theory be true, we require no stronger proof for regarding the non-dualistic philosophy (we do not mean the monistic) as the essential doctrine of the Tamilian religion and the path of Love as that pointed out by the Tamilian saints. Purapporul, besides dealing with the functions of the king, also makes a passing reference to principles of asceticism and means of salvation. There are other minor divisions, such as Kalaviyal, Karpiyal, and Meyppâttiyal, which succeed the two just mentioned. But the former two of these are only an exposition of Ahapporul, and Meyppâttiyal is a brief chapter on psychology. Tolkâppiyar derives all the figures of rhetoric from simile, and therefore he names the chapter on rhetoric Uvamaviyal. His last chapter is on idiom in Tamil; and that is called Marapiyal. From this brief analysis of Porul, it will be seen what a wonderfull work the *Tolkâppiyam* is, and what a valuable bequest, in the shape of his commentaries, Nacchinâkkiniyar has made to the Tamil people. It is no exaggeration to say that Poruladhikâram-study must have perished long ago but for Nacchinârkiniyar's commentaries; for all later treatises on Porul, such as the *Virasoliyam* and the *Ilakkanavilakkam* were written after his time.

The *Pattuppâttu* is a collection of ten Tamil idyls. "The idyls are, as the name implies, richly wrought descriptive poems in the most finished style. They are charming portraits of nature in some of her pleasant and striking moods, and for soberness of thought and accuracy of representation, they will bear comparison with any thing in the whole realm of literature."* The book is written in the old classical style, and the modern student, without the help of the commentary cannot grasp the thought of a single line. A patient study of this work, however, gives us an insight into the state of Tamil society in the Sangham age, that is, about the first century A. D., and a full knowledge of its manners and customs at that remote period. Besides, the book abounds in historical references, which are important to those who are attempting to construct a history of the South India of those early times. The materials that Nacchinârkkiniyar had to write his commentary with have no longer an independent existence. Were it not that his commentary has been handed down to us, we should have lost them irreparably, and the state of the Tamil country in the Sangham age would be a matter of mere conjecture.

S. Anavaratavinayakam Pillai, M.A.

(*To be continued.*)

NOTES AND COMMENTS.

The Neo-Hegelian school is again to the forefront in the powerful person of Dr. James Ward, Professor of Philosophy in the University of Cambridge. His Gifford lectures on "Naturalism and Agnosticism" has been brought out

* *Madras Christian College Magazine*, March 1891. "The Ten Tamil Idyls'.—1. Page 661.

in book form in two volumes by the Messrs. Black. The aim of the lectures is to show the utter untenability of the position of the Dualist by approaching the question from the physical as well as the psychological standpoint. They are divided into five parts which seek to show that the union of "Naturalism and Agnosticism" constituting "Modern Scientific Thought," though it has led to a widespread prejudice against Idealism, and so against Theism, has yet really promoted the interests of both.

* * * * *

It has brought out the abstract discriptive character of the *Mechanical Theory*, which had been regarded as presenting "what actually goes on behind what we see and feel." The futility of attempts, such as that of Mr. Spencer, to deduce the *Evolution* of life, mind and society from a single mechanical principle is then evident. Further, the *Relation of Body to Mind* has to be treated as a "correspondence" that is neither causal physically nor causal logically. The perplexities of this *Dualism* lead to a neutral (or agnostic) Monism, which—being essentially unstable—must either lapse back into Materialism or advance to Idealism. Reflection upon experience as a whole shows how this dualism has arisen, and also that it is false. It becomes clear that only in *terms of mind* can we understand the unity, activity and regularity that nature presents.

* * * * * *

Analogy which has always been the very bane of philosophical systems in India, and whose purpose and use have been considerably misunderstood in all the dualistic cults, is thus spoken of in Professor Ward's valuable lectures. (Vol. I. p. 119) "Analogy, as we know, is a good servant, but a bad master; for, when master, it does more to blind than it may previously have done to illuminate. Most of us, I suppose, have chanced to observe a bee buzzing up and down within the four sides of a window-pane, vainly endeavouring to escape by the only obvious way—the way most light comes; whereas by merely traversing the dark border of the window-frame it might at once reach the open casement. The history of science in full of instances of able men similarly thwarted by a too prepossessing analogy,"

* * * * * *

With this observation of Dr. Ward, we can compare the remarks of Sankara's on the same topic in his Bhashya on the Brahma-Sutras under III. 2. 20 "Whenever two things are compared, they are so only with reference to some particular point they have in common. Entire equality of the two can never be demonstrated; indeed if it could be demonstrated, there would be an end of that particular relation which gives rise to the comparison."

* * * * * *

Sankara foresaw in a way the clamorous tendency of the human mind to break its neck over shadows without minding the substance, and the appositeness of his remarks can be fully appreciated only by a study of various religious systems in which sensuous emotion takes the place of true insight, and images more please the fancy than truth.

* * * * * *

Dr. Macodonell's "Sanskrit Literature" is one of the latest publications of the year, a detailed notice of which we must reserve for a future number. It contains the up to date results of the best achievements of Sanskrit scholarship based upon researches literary, epigraphical and archaeological. After alluding to Dr. Thibaut's well-known views, the Oxford professor of Sanskrit makes out that the Sutras of Badarayana teach distinctly the monism of Sankara and nothing else. The influence of Sanskrit poetry upon some German and English authors, which is well sketched, is a novel feature of the book.

* * * * * *

One of the attractive phases of Dr. Macdonell's performance lies in the easy, flowing and graceful style in which the book is written. A casual reader can easily dip, without any serious difficulty of comprehending the contest, into any part of the book, and he will be tempted to go on and on till the end of the volume with hardly any strain on his mind, and with his interest in the subject not flagging. Being a Vedic scholar himself, Dr. Macdonell deals with the early period of Sanskrit literature with a fulness and grasp which are patent in every line. More than all, the dry tedium which is incidential to an examination of the Vedic literature, however cursory, is conspicuously absent.

* * * * * *

Our Exchanges.—The Dawn for May, 1900, (Vol. III, No. 10) presents us with a varied and interesting bill of fare. In the first article, the Editor discourses on the Indian Economic Problem, in the form of a discussion with Sir George Birdwood; and Dr. Nishikant Chaltopadhyaya translates the mystic story of Peter Schlemihl from the German, while in a short review of Mr. M. Rengacharya's version of the Sri Bhashya of Ramanuja, a high compliment is paid to the Sanskrit scholarship of our Madras graduates, which would certainly be amusing to any one acquainted with this University. Mr. Mullick gives a host of valuable details regarding our Mutts in the first instalment of an article on Hindu Religious Institutions. If our contemporary always appears in as good a turn-out as here, we must really congratulate him on the valuable services he would be doing not only to the general run of readers, but also to those specially interested in religious questions. We also acknowledge with thanks the receipt of the following journals:—*The Theosophical Review, The Lamp, Occult Truths, The Brahmavadin, The Indian Journal of Education, The Theosophic Gleaner, The Arya Bala Bodhini*, and *The Astrological Magazine.*

Just Published, pages iii, 440, 8vo, cloth Price Eighteen Shillings.

THE NALADIAR

OR

FOUR HUNDRED QUATRAINS IN TAMIL

WITH

Introduction, Translation and Notes, Critical, Philological and Explanatory

TO WHICH IS ADDED

A CONCORDANCE AND LEXICON

with Authorities from the oldest Tamil writers

BY THE

REV. G. U. POPE, M. A., D. D.,

Sometime Fellow of the Madras University, Member of the Royal Asiatic Society

AND OF

the German Oriental Society.

FIFTY COPIES HAVE BEEN PRINTED ON LARGE PAPER, FOR WHICH EARLY APPLICATION IS NECESSARY. PRICE TWO POUNDS PER COPY.

Other Works

BY

THE REV. G. U. POPE, M. A., D. D.

FOURTH EDITION, MUCH ENLARGED. IN THREE PARTS. TWELVE SHILLINGS AND SIX PENCE EACH.

A TAMIL HAND-BOOK

OR

Full Introduction to the Common Dialect of that Language.

PART I.

I. Introduction.
   1. History of the Language and Literature.
   2. Orthography, Pronunciation.
II. Grammatical, Lessons, Vocabularies and Exercises.
III. General Index.

PART II.

Appendices—Reading Lessons, Paradigms.
Notes on the Study of the 'Kural'.
Key to the Exercises.

PART III.

Dictionaries—
   I. Tamil-English.
   II. English-Tamil.

Siddhanta Deepika

ADVERTISING RATES.

THE JOURNAL HAS A CIRCULATION

Throughout India, and European Countries.

One insertion	... ...	Rs. 10 a page.
Two insertions	... ...	„ 15 „
Three „	... ...	„ 20 „
Six „	... ...	„ 36 „
Twelve „	... ...	„ 50 „

Octavo, 12 s.

THE SACRED KURAL OF TIRUVALLUVA-NAYANAR

WITH

Metrical Translation, Notes, Grammar, Lexion and Conordane.

Other Works

BY

THE REV. G. U. POPE, M. A., D. D.

Fifth Edition, Crown 8vo, price 7s. 6d.

First Lessons in Tamil

OR

An Introduction to the Common Dialect of that Language,

For the use of Foreigners learning Tamil, and of Tamilian. learning English, with an easy Catechism in Tamil of both Colloquial and Classical Dialects. 5th Edition.

Ready for Sale.

SRI BHAGAVAD GITA.

With **Sri Ramanujacharya's** Commentary, Translated into English by A. GOVINDACHARLU, C. E, F. T. S.

Demy 8vo. 600pp.

(*a*) Full superior calico, gold lettered	Rs.	10 0 0
(*b*) Full calico, with printed title	...	9 0 0
(*c*) Full paper, with printed title	...	8 0 0

BY THE SAME AUTHOR.

THE TABLE OF THE 32 UPANISHAD VIDYAS.

Printed on glazed card in colored ink ... Rs. 0 6 0

LECTURES ON INSPIRATION, INTUITION, & ECSTASY.

Part I (*Occidental*)	... ...	0 6 0
Part II (*Oriental*)	... ...	0 7 0
Part III *Theosophical*	... ...	0 5 0

Apply to :—**A. GOVINDACHARLU**, C. E. F. T. S.,
VEDA GRIHAM,
Mysore (India.)

The Viveka Chintamani,

Monthly Tamil Magazine and Review,

Subscription Yearly Rs. 4.

NO SUBSCRIPTION RECEIVED FOR PART OF A VOLUME,

Volume begins May of each year and ends with April.

Gospel of Buddha

By

DR. PAUL CARUS,

Revised Edition Rupees **1—12—0**
By V. P. P. Rs. **1—14—0**

Only a few copies on hand.

APPLY SHARP TO—
C. V. SWAMINATHA IAYAR,
Secretary, D. K. Agency,
Triplicane, Madras.

Most Important Notice.

JUST PUBLISHED

A

Table of Tatwas.

Exhibiting in full and accurutely

IN THE FORM OF PRANAVA

THE SAGUNA
AND THE NIRGUNA
AND THE ATYASRAMA
AND THE SIDDHANTA IDEALS.

with Full references.

Price Rupee One. & as. 8.

APPLY TO :—

THE PUBLISHER
SIDDHANTA DEEPIKA,
MADRAS.

SRI KASI VASI S. SENTHINATHIER.

Our Saints' Calendar.

நாயன்மார்கள் திருநக்ஷத்திரம்.

English Month.		The Names of saints.
September. 1900.	3	Kungiliyakalayar
	22	Arulnandhi Sivam
October.	2	Yenadhi Nayanar
	5	Narasingamunaiar
	9	Rudra Pasupatiar
	12	NADANAR
	15	Sakti Nayanar
	23	ST. MEIKANDA DEVA
	25	Pûsalar
	27	Aiyadigal
November.	6	Nedumarar
	11	Idamkariar
	16	Meipporul Nayanar
	17	Anayar
	24	Murugar
	25	Sirappuliar

PHOTOGRAPHS ! PHOTOGRAPHS !!

"Secure the shadow before the substance fades"

C. VARATHARAJULU & Co.,

ARTISTS AND PHOTOGRAPHERS,

69, *MALAYAPERUMAL STREET,*

ESPLANADE, MADRAS.

Photographs of all sizes and in all its latest permanent processes can be taken in our studio at moderate terms.

A TRIAL IS SOLICITED.

Views of the Southern India and Streesaila Parvad (The Kailasam) can be had. 8″ × 6″ per dozen Rs. 12.

One set of Streesailum views containing :—

The golden temple Streeparvad (The Kailasum) in 8 × 6. The golden vemana. The front gateway, the inner gateway. The sculptured wall. Pathala Gunga (the bathing-ghat). Chenchus. The temple tree with some Sanyasins. The Siva-Parvaty. The panorama of the Neel-gunga and the Krishna and Mahanandy cost only Rs. 5.

A single copy of the golden temple Streeparvad (the Kailasum) in 8 × 6 costs Rupee 1.

A single of Mahanandy in cabinet size costs Annas 8.

MADRAS:—Printed by P. C. Kalliana Sundara Nadar, at the C. N. Press, and Published by J. M. Nagarathnam.